S. Prt. 99-213

A BRIEF HISTORY
of the

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry United States Senate and Landmark Agricultural Legislation

1825–1986

PRINTED FOR THE USE OF THE COMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1986

S162-1

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

JESSE HELMS, North Carolina, *Chairman*

BOB DOLE, Kansas	EDWARD ZORINSKY, Nebraska
RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana	PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont
THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi	JOHN MELCHER, Montana
RUDY BOSCHWITZ, Minnesota	DAVID H. PRYOR, Arkansas
PAULA HAWKINS, Florida	DAVID L. BOREN, Oklahoma
MARK ANDREWS, North Dakota	ALAN J. DIXON, Illinois
PETE WILSON, California	HOWELL HEFLIN, Alabama
MITCH McCONNELL, Kentucky	TOM HARKIN, Iowa

KEITH H. WEATHERLY, *Chief of Staff*

TERRANCE J. WEAR, *General Counsel*

CARL P. ROSE, *General Counsel and Staff Director for the Minority*

WARREN B. OXFORD, *Chief Clerk*

FOREWORD

For 155 years the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry has helped establish, guide, and examine agricultural policies. The Committee has been active in times of prosperity or peace, as well as in times of depression or war. This document commemorates the achievements of the Committee through 1986.

The 1930s were a major watershed in agricultural policymaking. Prior to that time, agricultural enactments were related primarily to providing educational opportunities for rural residents or were of a service nature to agriculture. However, the depression of the 1930s redirected the thinking of agricultural leaders toward price supports and production controls to limit these mounting surpluses. From the 1930s, the centerpieces of agricultural policy have been periodic omnibus farm bills which adjust production, based on existing and anticipated economic conditions, using a combination of price supports, income supports, supply management programs, and marketing programs. Under these programs, a growing proportion of the country's producers have become increasingly reliant on Federal programs rather than the marketplace.

These programs have not been effective in recent years and have resulted in burgeoning surpluses and escalating Federal commodity program costs. The Food Security Act of 1985 started a readjustment that should reduce the government's role in commodity programs, saving Federal tax dollars and moving toward greater reliance on the free market. When fully implemented, the provisions of this Act will encourage more farmers to grow for the marketplace, not for Federal subsidy programs. By reducing Federal farm program costs, the 1985 farm bill should also remove the stigma that has arisen recently that farm programs are merely a rural welfare program.

In addition to the omnibus legislation, the Committee has been very active in developing legislation that contributes to the general social well-being. This activity has resulted in programs that protect the quality of food, that use our surpluses to develop overseas markets and to help the less fortunate both in the United States and in other lands, that protect soil, water and forest resources, that support research to enhance American agriculture, and that provide education and information assistance for rural Americans.

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service. It updates a Committee history released in 1970. Preparation of the history was coordinated by Jeffrey A. Zinn of the Food and Agriculture Section, Environment and Natural Resources Policy Division.

Several individuals from that section and from the Government Division prepared the various sections of this summary.

JESSE HELMS,
Chairman.

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	III
History of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry	1
Agricultural Policy Overview	33
Landmarks in Agricultural Legislation	37
Commodities: Legislation and Programs	42
Farm Credit: Legislation and Programs	49
International Trade and Aid: Legislation and Programs	53
Resource Conservation: Legislation and Programs	57
Forestry: Legislation and Programs	61
Research and Education: Legislation and Programs	64
Rural Development: Legislation and Programs	68
Food Assistance, Consumer, and Food Market Activities: Legislation and Programs	71
The Future	76

HISTORY OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is one of the oldest standing committees in the U.S. Senate. Though the committee, generally speaking, gained its present name, size, and jurisdiction as a result of the Senate committee reorganization of 1977, its history and evolution can be traced back to the earliest years of the Senate's standing committee system.

Before 1816, the Senate had not considered it necessary to create standing committees to consider legislative matters.[1] In the opinion of many Senators, the smaller, more intimate size of the Senate in those days obviated the need to create permanent working groups. In addition, some Members felt that the Constitution did not empower the Senate to create standing committees.[2] Therefore, in the period before 1816 the Senate created only select committees to consider legislation. These panels usually expired upon completion of their assigned duties, which were often quite limited.

By 1816, it had become apparent that the political demands and problems of a rapidly growing nation could not be solved within the time allotted for a select committee or even a single Congress. The need for permanent legislative committees devoting continuous attention to important legislative matters soon became apparent. Consequently, on December 10, 1816, the Senate established 11 standing legislative committees, adding a twelfth committee one week later on December 18.[3]

After the initial burst of creation, no new standing committees were added until December 9, 1825, when the Senate by a vote of 22–14 approved a resolution providing for the creation of a standing Committee on Agriculture.[4] The reasons for its creation are unclear, though several factors are likely involved.

In the first two decades of the 19th century, several new frontier States were added to the Union. The newly admitted States caused the Senate to focus greater attention on agricultural issues, as the

[1] Until that time, the only standing committees in the Senate were housekeeping or purely administrative in nature.

[2] George Lee Robinson. The Development of the Senate Committee System. Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1955. p. 21.

[3] Walter Kravitz. Evolution of the Senate's Committee System. In Changing Congress: the Committee System. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 411, January 1974. p. 28.

[4] Register of Debates in Congress. December 9, 1825. p. 5.

economies in these States were primarily dependent on agriculture.[5] This effect became apparent sooner in the House of Representatives, which created a standing Committee on Agriculture in 1820.

As is the case today, agriculture in the early 19th century was intertwined with other great issues of commerce and the economy. Federal lands policy, tariffs on imported goods, monetary affairs, internal improvements (canals and roads to transport farm goods) and other issues touched both directly and indirectly on the Nation's agricultural interests.[6] Though agriculture's place in the economy was not in dispute, by 1825 its potential place in the Senate's standing committee system was a matter of some debate. Members differed over whether agricultural matters required a separate committee or could be handled by standing committees then in existence.

The Committee on Agriculture was created amid controversy concerning the Committee on Commerce and Manufactures. The Senate Committee on Commerce and Manufactures, one of the original standing committees created in 1816, had become a focus of controversy over the tariff question by the mid–1820's. Trade and manufacturing interests often clashed among Committee Members leading to frequent stalemates over such matters. Consequently, by 1825, some Members felt that the Committee should be divided into a Committee on Commerce and a Committee on Manufactures to avoid conflict in committee over tariff policy.

On December 7, 1825, Senator Mahlon Dickerson of New Jersey submitted a resolution dividing the committee. As debate on the measure began, Senator William Findlay of Pennsylvania submitted an amendment which proposed adding agriculture to the proposed Committee on Manufactures. Senator Robert Hayne of South Carolina, though opposed to Dickerson's resolution separating the Committee on Commerce and Manufactures, considered the addition of agriculture to the present committee a wise action. Such a panel, he claimed, would combine the major economic interests of the country into a single committee and allow for coordinated economic policies. Senator John Rowan of Kentucky opposed including agriculture among the subjects of any Senate standing committee because he felt that agriculture was outside the "scope of the powers" of the Senate. Senator John Holmes of Maine responded that before a "Committee on Agriculture" was established some notion of its duties should be outlined. He for one, was uncertain that such a committee would have sufficient jurisdiction to justify its creation.[7]

These concerns caused the amendment to fail on a voice vote. However, Senator Findlay and others felt strongly that agriculture deserved a place within the Senate's standing committee system. Consequently, on the Senate's next day of session, December 9, Sen-

---

[5] U.S. Senate, The United States Senate: 1787–1801. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1961. p. 316. (87th Congress, 1st session, S. Doc. No. 64).

[6] Murray Reed Benedict. Farm Policies of the United States: 1790–1950. New York, Octagon Books, 1953, pp. 13–17.

[7] Register of Debates, December 7, 1825, pp. 2–4.

ator Findlay submitted a resolution providing for the creation of a standing Committee on Agriculture. He argued that agriculture was one of "three great branches of domestic industry" along with commerce and manufacturing. All three, he claimed, were equally entitled to the care and protection of the Government. He contended further that agricultural interests were not always best served along with those of commerce; that certain laws might operate to the benefit of commerce which might depress agriculture.

Senator Holmes remained concerned over whether the committee would have sufficient duties. He contented that most matters under the jurisdiction of such a panel could be handled within the present committee system. The issue was not one of the importance of agriculture, he claimed, but of the manner in which the Senate considered the subject.

Senator Levi Woodbury of New Hampshire responded to this argument in rather sweeping fashion. A supporter of the resolution, he stated:

> That there was no employment for such a committee, [has] been again pressed by the ingenious gentleman from Maine: but, in addition to the answer given by the mover of the resolution, [I] would suggest, that all questions of direct taxes on land; all internal duties and excises; and all imposts, no less than questions of foreign and internal commerce, have a powerful, and, often, an immediate influence on the interests of agriculture. And, in a territory like ours, of between two and three millions of square miles; with two-thirds of its population exclusively engaged in agriculture; with annual exports from agriculture of about forty millions; and with, probably, fifteen millions of our duties paid, in the end, by the tillers of the soil, who consume, and not by the merchants, who import—it is impossible not to find subjects peculiarly proper, in some stage of their progress through this House, to be referred to such a committee.[8]

Debate on the matter concluded that day. The Senate approved the resolution by a vote of 22–14. By this vote the Senate declared that agriculture deserved separate status within the committee system.

Despite the potential breadth of the Agriculture Committee's jurisdiction, the Committee in its first four decades developed a rather limited legislative agenda. Many of the important agricultural issues of the early to mid 19th century centered on tariffs, trade, the disposition of public lands, and internal improvements—as Senator Woodbury had described. However, as Senator Holmes had argued, these were matters handled primarily by other committees.[9] In addition,

---

[8] Register of Debates, December 9, 1825. p. 6.

[9] The interest of the Agriculture Committee in such matters was not unacknowledged by the Senate, however. During a highly charged debate on tariffs in 1832, a motion was made to refer

Continued

Congress' seeming unwillingness to establish a direct Federal role in agriculture during these years reduced substantially the potential for an active Senate Committee on Agriculture.[10]

The prevailing sentiment against a Federal presence in agriculture at times denied the Committee potential jurisdiction. For example, in 1839, Congress established a program for the collection and distribution of agricultural statistics.[11] However, because the program was administered by the Patent Office, it was not considered within the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Committee. Thus, the Committee was prevented from considering what some have deemed one of the few ongoing Federal efforts in support of agriculture before the Civil War.[12]

Matters considered by the Agriculture Committee during this period included petitions requesting government encouragement of domestic cultivation of imported commodities (silk and tropical products, for example), resolutions for the creation of national agricultural schools and societies, measures recommending price relief on certain imported goods, and in 1850, a resolution for the creation of an Agriculture Bureau within the Department of the Interior. This latter measure, reported favorably by the Committee but never considered by the Senate, apparently reflected the early stages of growing sentiment in the Senate for an expanded Government role in support of agriculture. However, this sentiment did not build sufficiently to prevent a brief hiatus in the Committee's service.

On March 23, 1854 Senator Philip Allen of Rhode Island, Chairman of the Committee, moved that the Senate appoint a clerk for the Agriculture Committee. The motion was approved but a motion to reconsider the vote, offered by Senator John Weller of California, prompted debate on the Committee's need for a clerk. Senator Weller questioned the necessity of appointing a clerk for a committee that met "two or three times during a session of Congress." Senator Allen defended his proposition as being only temporary, for the assistance of the Committee only in the business before it, and not for the entire session. Senator Benjamin Wade of Ohio, a Committee Member, expressed his dismay at seeing the Agriculture Committee singled out, as other committees with less to do, in his judgment, employed clerks.[13]

The motion to reconsider was not approved, but the debate had revealed perhaps a growing sense that the Senate standing committee system had grown larger than its legislative agenda. The issue of committee clerks for inactive panels had become a recurring theme

---

the entire question of tariffs to the Committee on Agriculture. There was no debate on the resolution, but the measure was narrowly defeated by a vote of 18–22. (Congressional Globe, March 19, 1832. p. 591.).

[10] See Report of the Secretary of the Interior, Congressional Globe, 31st Congress, 1st Session, Appendix, December 3, 1849. p. 21.

[11] Century of Service: the First 100 Years of the Department of Agriculture, Centennial Committee, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1963. p. 5.

[12] Report of the Secretary of the Interior, Congressional Globe, Appendix, p. 21.

[13] Congressional Globe, March 23, 1854. p. 727.

in Senate debate by the mid-1850's. On December 9, 1856, during debate on a resolution authorizing committee clerks, Senator Hamilton Fish of New York again raised the issue of unnecessary clerk hiring, and objected to consideration of the resolution at that time. Consequently, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Retrenchment for further study and review.[14]

On December 23, 1856, the matter was considered and debate proceeded on the question of whether certain committees had sufficient duties to justify hiring clerks. The resolution was amended and approved, but upon its approval the Senate adopted a second resolution submitted by Senator Judah P. Benjamin of Louisiana to create a special committee to study methods "to reduce the number and increase the efficiency of the committees."[15]

On February 17, 1857, the special committee reported a resolution amending Senate rules to consolidate or abolish certain standing committees. The Committee on Agriculture was not included in the list of new or reorganized committees contained in the resolution. On February 24, the Senate considered the special committee's proposal. However, since the end of the 34th Congress was drawing near, the matter was tabled.[16]

On March 5, 1857, during a special session of the Senate, the special committee's recommendations were again considered. On that day the Senate approved the resolution, as amended, and the Committee on Agriculture was abolished.[17] It seems clear from the public record that the lack of a clear legislative mandate during those early years led to the abolition of the Committee on Agriculture.[18]

The Committee on Agriculture was recreated by the Senate 6 years later, at the beginning of the 38th Congress, on March 6, 1863. During the 6-year interim, bills to establish agricultural professorships and to incorporate the United States Agricultural Society, which likely would have been handled by the Committee, were referred to the Committee on Public Lands and the Committee on the District of Columbia, respectively.

Senator John Sherman of Ohio, who sponsored the resolution recreating the panel, was appointed the Committee's new Chairman. The specific reasons for the Committee's recreation are unclear. The matter was not debated on the Senate floor, and there was no apparent effort underway at the time to change the standing committee system.

The Committee may have been recreated as a result of the establishment in 1862 of the Department of Agriculture. Since the proposal for a Bureau of Agriculture in 1850, support had grown for increasing Federal support for agriculture. Though the organic act of the Department contained broad language and authorized no major

---

[14] Congressional Globe, December 9, 1856. p. 57.
[15] Congressional Globe, December 23, 1856, pp. 182–184.
[16] Congressional Globe, February 24, 1857, p. 848.
[17] Journal of the Senate, March 5, 1857. p. 386.
[18] George Lee Robinson, The Development of the Senate Committee System, pp. 152–154.

new agricultural programs, it succeeded in establishing an ongoing institutional presence in agriculture, and thus the need for funds and congressional oversight of administration.

The Committee's concern with the new department became apparent almost immediately. One of the first measures reported from the recreated panel was a joint resolution providing additional office space for departmental employees. Significantly, among the Department's duties listed as requiring additional office facilities was the collection and distribution of agricultural statistics, an area formerly considered outside the Committee's jurisdiction. Apparently, the consolidation of certain agricultural programs within a single department had affected the jurisdiction of the reconstituted Committee on Agriculture.[19]

Throughout the latter half of the 19th century, the Committee on Agriculture established its jurisdiction in a number of areas. The Committee considered and reported legislation on forest reserves and timber lands, agricultural experiment stations, animal industry, commodity prices, and agricultural sciences. Forestry became an especially important part of the Committee's responsibility. In fact, the addition of a Bureau of Forestry to the Department of Agriculture in the mid-1870's prompted the Senate to change the panel's name to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in 1884.[20]

A further indication of the broad scope of the Committee's activities in these early years came on February 10, 1879, when the Senate adopted a concurrent resolution supporting the advancement of agricultural interests. The resolution included a statement authorizing the agriculture committees of both chambers

> to consider generally the subject of agriculture, and report, by bill or otherwise, what can or ought to be done by the General Government to better advance, encourage, and foster agricultural interests . . .[21]

Jurisdictions for most Senate standing committees were not defined by written rule until 1947. Broad grants of committee authority by written rule or resolution were uncommon until that time. Though the resolution was not approved by the House, its approval by the Senate indicated support by that body for the Committee's attention to a wide range of matters in the agricultural field.

Events surrounding the creation and early development of the Senate Committee on Appropriations had a significant effect on the Agriculture Committee's jurisdiction during the latter portion of the 19th century. The creation of the Appropriations Committee in 1867 led to the consolidation of most general appropriations bills within that Committee's jurisdiction by 1877. In that year the Senate for-

---

[19] Congressional Globe, February 18, 1864. p. 719.

[20] U.S. Senate. Temporary Select Committee to Study the Senate Committee System. The Senate Committee System; first staff report. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1976. p. 15. (94th Congress, 2d Session, Committee print).

[21] Congressional Record, vol. 8, February 10, 1879. p. 64.

mally amended its rules to centralize jurisdiction over most general appropriations within the Appropriations Committee. However, the new procedure raised fears that, among other factors, such authority was excessive and limited the legislative influence of the other standing committees.[22]

The Committee on Agriculture, on January 26, 1883, reported a resolution amending Senate rules to transfer jurisdiction over Department of Agriculture appropriations from the Committee on Appropriations to the Committee on Agriculture. The Agriculture Committee's resolution was one of several similar proposals during this period. Though no action was taken on the matter at that time, sentiment continued to grow in the Senate to transfer certain appropriations measures, including appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, from the Appropriations Committee to authorizing committees.[23]

Pressure mounted for change throughout the latter portion of the 19th century. Finally, on December 21, 1898, a resolution was submitted by Senator Thomas H. Carter of Montana amending Senate rules to require referral of certain general appropriations to authorizing committees, including referral of the Department of Agriculture appropriations to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Rules Committee reported the resolution on January 27, 1899, and the Senate gave its approval the next day.

The new practice continued until March 6, 1922. On that date the Senate reconcentrated jurisdiction over general appropriations bills within the Appropriations Committee. For the most part, this action was in response to changes in executive branch budgeting procedures enacted by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. In addition, the House of Representatives in 1920 had recentralized jurisdiction over appropriations measures within its Appropriations Committee. These two actions caused the Senate to reconsider its appropriations procedures, and thus prompted the change. However, in order to avert renewed fears that the Appropriations Committee would gain excessive legislative authority, the Senate amended the new rule to stipulate that authorizing committees affected by the change would be guaranteed ex officio membership on Appropriations subcommittees considering appropriations formerly within their jurisdiction. Under the rule, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was granted three ex officio members, with full voting privileges, during consideration of the agriculture appropriations bill, and one conferee when the measure reached the House-Senate conference stage.[24]

The jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture was defined by rule for the first time pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The 1946 Act, among other reforms, reduced the number of standing Senate committees from 33 to 16 and set out the first writ-

---

[22] George Lee Robinson. The Development of the Senate Committee System. pp. 269-271.

[23] Congressional Record, January 26, 1883. p. 1600.

[24] The rule regarding ex officio membership on the Appropriations Committee was abolished by the Committee Reorganization Amendments of 1977, S. Res. 4, effective February 4, 1977.

ten statements of House and Senate committee jurisdiction. The jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Foresty was defined as follows:

1. Agriculture generally.
2. Inspection of livestock and meat products.
3. Animal industry and diseases of animals.
4. Adulteration of seeds, insect pests, and protection of birds and animals in forest reserves.
5. Agricultural college and experiment stations.
6. Foresty in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.
7. Agricultural economics and research.
8. Agricultural and industrial chemistry.
9. Dairy industry.
10. Entomology and plant quarantine.
11. Human nutrition and home economics.
12. Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.
13. Agricultural educational extension services.
14. Extension of farm credit and farm security.
15. Rural electrification.
16. Agricultural production and marketing and stablization of prices of agricultural products.
17. Crop insurance and soil conservation.[25]

Though the 1946 reorganization altered the jurisdictions of several standing committees, the measure primarily confirmed the authority of the Committee on Agriculture and Foresty over subjects already considered to be within its jurisdiction. Only two changes in the Committee's jurisdiction were enacted by the new law. The Agriculture Committee gained jurisdiction over farm credit and farm security, an area it had formerly shared with the Committee on Banking and Currency (renamed the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970). The Committee's jurisdiction over the school lunch program was transferred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (later renamed the Committee on Labor and Human Resources). However, the Senate continued to refer school lunch legislation to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry because the program originated as a way to use surpluses of agricultural commodities.[26]

By the mid-1970's pressure had again mounted for realignment of the Senate's committee structure. Certain public policy issues gaining prominence by the 1970's, such as energy and the environment, were not foreseen when jurisdictions were defined by rule in 1946. Consequently, many Members claimed that committee jurisdiction over many important emerging issues were clouded and fragmented. In

---

[25] Public Law 601, 79th Congress. 60 Stat 815.

[26] U.S. Senate. Temporary Select Committee to Study the Senate Committee System. The Senate Committee System; staff report. 94th Cong., 2d Sess. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., p. 147. (Committee print. 94th Cong., 2d Sess.)

addition, Senators complained of proliferating committee and subcommittee assignments, outmoded scheduling procedures, and inequitable distribution of committee workload.

Responding to these and other criticisms, the Senate on March 30, 1976, adopted S. Res. 109, creating the Temporary Select Committee to Study the Senate Committee System and directing it to conduct a thorough study of Senate committee jurisdictions, organization, and structure. The Select Committee reported, among other matters, its recommendations for jurisdictional realignment on November 15, 1976 (S. Rept. 94-1395).

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was highlighted during the Select Committee's deliberations. Testimony revealed that during the 93rd Congress less than half of all measures relating to agriculture, food, and nutrition, broadly defined, had been referred to the agriculture committees of each chamber.[27]

The Select Committee, in considering this and other factors, concluded that the "vast importance of American agriculture to the economy of the United States and the welfare of the world" required a separate Committee on Agriculture with substantially enlarged jurisdiction.[28] The Select Committee therefore recommended the creation of a Committee on Agriculture and Small Business.

According to the Select Committee's plan, the new committee would have combined the jurisdictions of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (except "agricultural colleges", which the Select Committee recommended transferring to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources), the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs,[29] the Select Committee on Small Business, and jurisdiction over regional economic development, irrigation, reclamation, and land use planning.

> With its added responsibilities, the new Committee on Agriculture and Small Business would oversee important comprehensive policy areas and have a workload much closer to those of the other 13 standing committees. It would not only legislate for the production of food and fiber, including all aspects of nutrition, but would also represent the needs of another fundamental segment of the American economy and society—small business. In addition, the parent committee's responsibility for rural development would be expanded to include rural, urban and regional economic development. Moreover, the new committee would exercise leadership over the subjects now reviewed by the Select Commit-

---

[27] U.S. Senate. Temporary Select Committee to Study the Senate Committee System. First with recommendations. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1976. p. 8. (94th Cong., 2d Sess. S. Rept. 1395).

[28] Ibid., p. 75.

[29] The Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs was established by the Senate on July 30, 1968, to study hunger-related problems in the United States. The 13-member committee included members of both the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

tee on Nutrition and Human Needs and in the newly recognized field of food from fresh and salt waters.[30]

In addition to its general recommendations for committee jurisdiction, the Select Committee applied the concept of "comprehensive policy oversight" to address the problem of jurisdictional fragmentation. By acknowledging that complex, interrelated policies will inevitably cross jurisdictional boundaries, and that shared jurisdiction over such matters is advisable where competition may yield new ideas, the Select Committee did not attempt to resolve every instance of jurisdictional overlap. Instead, the Select Committee attempted "to identify committee responsibility explicitly for the integrated study of complex questions within this moderately fragmented structure" and establish "comprehensive policy oversight jurisdictions, which extend in some cases beyond a committee's legislative jurisdiction." [31] Thus, committees were authorized to study and investigate certain broad policy areas, though legislative jurisdiction over aspects of these areas may be shared or reside entirely with other committees.

Pursuant to this concept, the Select Committee recommended that the new Committee on Agriculture and Small Business be granted comprehensive policy oversight over food, nutrition, and hunger, both national and international, and over small business enterprises.

The Select Committee's recommendations for Senate committee reorganization were referred to the Senate Rules Committee and reported as S. Res. 4 on January 25, 1977. During its consideration of the Select Committee's recommendations, the Rules Committee made many modifications to the original proposals based on additional testimony and information received from Members of Congress and others. Consequently, recommendations relating to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry were modified as well, though several were approved unchanged.

Nonetheless, S. Res. 4 recommended significant changes in the Agriculture Committee's jurisdiction. While the Rules Committee did not recommend the creation of a new Committee on Agriculture and Small Business, it did propose changing the Committee's name to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. Thus, human nutrition, an area already within the Committee's legislative purview, was highlighted as a separate subject area within the Committee's jurisdiction. The Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs was to be abolished effective December 31, 1977, and its investigative and oversight jurisdiction transferred to the Agriculture Committee. Consequently, legislative and oversight jurisdiction over human nutrition was consolidated within the Committee.

The Rules Committee recommended adopting the Select Committee's proposal for "comprehensive policy oversight." Therefore, new language was added to the Committee's jurisdiction directing it to

---

[30] Ibid.

[31] Ibid., p. 23.

exercise comprehensive policy oversight over food, nutrition, and hunger, both foreign and domestic.[32] Again, though the new oversight language afforded no new legislative jurisdiction, it did focus review responsibility over these areas within a single committee for the first time.

The reported version of S. Res. 4 made other changes in the Committee's jurisdiction as well. The food stamp program, long an implicit part of the Committee's jurisdiction, was listed specifically in the new rule. The school lunch program, renamed school nutrition by S. Res. 4, was transferred from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (now the Committee on Labor and Human Resources) to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. This action formally recognized the Senate practice of referring such matters to the Agriculture Committee.[33] "Food from fresh waters," an area formerly unrecognized in Senate rules, was also added to the Committee's jurisdiction. Finally, as part of the larger effort to consolidate subject areas within committees, jurisdiction over agricultural colleges was transferred from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

S. Res. 4 was adopted by the Senate on February 4, 1977. All of the Rules Committee's recommendations for the Agriculture Committee contained in the resolution were approved by the Senate. The jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry adopted that day, and which remains intact to the present, is as follows:

Senate Rule XXV, Section 1:

> (a)(1) *Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry*, to which shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating primarily to the following subjects:
>
> 1. Agricultural economics and research.
> 2. Agricultural extension services and experiment stations.
> 3. Agricultural production, marketing, and stablization of prices.
> 4. Agricultural and agricultural commodities.
> 5. Animal industry and diseases.
> 6. Crop insurance and soil conservation.
> 7. Farm credit and farm security.
> 8. Food from fresh waters.
> 9. Food stamp programs.
> 10. Forestry, and forest reserves and wilderness areas other than those created from the public domain.
> 11. Home economics.

---

[32] Congressional Record, v. 123, February 1, 1977. p. 2897.

[33] U.S. Library of Congress. Congressional Research Service. The Mandate of the Senate Nutrition Committee. [Washington] by Walter Oleszek. February 3, 1978. p. 3.

12. Human nutrition.
13. Inspection of livestock, meat, and agricultural products.
14. Pests and pesticides.
15. Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.
16. Rural development, rural electrification, and watersheds.
17. School nutrition programs.

(2) Such committee shall also study and review, on a comprehensive basis, matters relating to food, nutrition, and hunger, both in the United States and in foreign countries, and rural affairs, and report thereon from time to time.

In recent years the Committee has expanded its efforts in a number of areas. Rural development, export promotion, environmental and energy aspects of agricultural programs, public assistance, and consumer legislation are but a few of the subjects under Committee consideration in recent years.

Complex modern issues of this magnitude continue to overlap committee jurisdictions, as the Select Committee predicted in 1976. Consequently, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry has developed important policy in these areas both on its own and in conjunction with the efforts of other Senate panels.

For example, the Committee shares oversight jurisdiction over pesticides with the Committee on Environment and Public Works. Further, while the Agriculture Committee has jurisdiction over P.L. 480, the Food for Peace program the Committee on Foreign Relations retains interest in the administration of the program through its authorization of the Agency for International Development.[34] Even forestry, with the addition of "wilderness areas" by S. Res. 4, is shared with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the latter having jurisdiction over forest reserves and wilderness areas created from the public domain.[35]

From its creation in 1825 to the present, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry has grown to prominence among Senate standing committees. A major reason for this is the continued importance of agriculture in the American economy.

> Agriculture and its related enterprises comprise the largest single part of the American economy, accounting for the employment of nearly 23 million people. Consequently, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry extends into virtually every area of the Nation's economy.[36]

---

[34] U.S. Senate. Committee on Rules and Administration. Committee System Reorganization Amendments of 1977; report. 95th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., p. 12. (95th Cong., 1st Sess. S. Rept. 95–2).

[35] U.S. Senate. Temporary Select Committee to study the Senate Committee System; first report, with recommendations. 94th Cong., 2d Sess. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., p. 77. (94th Cong., 2d Sess. S. Rept. 94–1395).

[36] U.S. Senate. Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. Legislative Review Activities during the 97th Congress; report. 98th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., p. 2. 98th Cong., 1st Sess. S. Rept. 98–38.

Though this statement describes agriculture's importance in the present, it could have been adapted from Senator Levi Woodbury's justification for the Committee's creation in 1825. The central role of agriculture in the American economy has not diminished, and thus the role of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry remains central in the Senate's standing committee system. It seems clear, therefore, that the Committee's work will continue to be an important part of the Senate's efforts to address pressing public needs for years to come.

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Committee at the present time is composed of 17 Members, 9 Republicans and 8 Democrats.

Following are the names of the Members in order of seniority and a list of the Committee staff.

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

COMMITTEE

Jesse Helms, North Carolina, *Chairman*

Bob Dole, Kansas
Richard G. Lugar, Indiana
Thad Cochran, Mississippi
Rudy Boschwitz, Minnesota
Paula Hawkins, Florida
Mark Andrews, North Dakota
Pete Wilson, California
Mitch McConnell, Kentucky

Edward Zorinsky, Nebraska
Patrick J. Leahy, Vermont
John Melcher, Montana
David H. Pryor, Arkansas
David L. Boren, Oklahoma
Alan J. Dixon, Illinois
Howell Heflin, Alabama
Tom Harkin, Iowa

COMMITTEE STAFF

Keith H. Weatherly, *Chief of Staff*
George S. Dunlop, *Chief of Staff**
Terrance J. Wear, *General Counsel*
J. Robert Franks, *General Counsel**
Carl P. Rose, *General Counsel and Staff Director for the Minority*
Warren B. Oxford, *Chief Clerk/Printer*
John J. Aguirre, *Professional Staff Member*
Benjamin I. Baker, *Special Counsel for the Minority*
Mary A. Barham, *Finance Clerk*
Thomas E. Boney, Jr., *Deputy Staff Director*
William J. Brooks, *Economist**
John Campbell, *Professional Staff Member**
Jack Cassidy, *Professional Staff Member**
Maria Collias, *Staff Assistant*
Charles F. Conner, *Professional Staff Member*
Jodie L. Day, *Calendar Clerk*
Mary M. Dunbar, *Staff Assistant*
Victoria L. Dutcher, *Finance Clerk**
David R. Dyer, *Economist*
David Fischer, *Special Counsel*
Robin Fontes, *Staff Assistant**
Norman Goodrich, *GPO Printing Clerk*
Kathy Harrington, *Staff Assistant*

Valda Harris, *Legal Assistant**
Mary P. Kinzer, *Staff Assistant*
Alexander S. Mathews, *Deputy Counsel*
S. Elizabeth Mitchener, *Calendar Clerk**
Darryl Nirenberg, *Professional Staff Member*
Charles M. Oellermann, *Economist*
Karen E. Reid, *Intern*
Ronald B. Phillips, *Press Secretary/Professional Staff Member*
Leslie Poe, *Staff Assistant*
Laura D. Rice, *Professional Staff Member*
Evelyn Schaub, *Hearing Clerk**
Deborah D. Schwertner, *Hearing Clerk*
Wanda Shipman, *Staff Assistant*

*Resigned during the 99th Congress.

MEMBERS OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY FROM 1825 to 1984 *

Nineteenth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Findlay, Chmn	Pa.
	Lloyd	Md.
	Branch	N.C.
	Woodbury	N. Mex.
	Bouligny	La.

Nineteenth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Willey, Chmn	Conn.
	Branch	N.C.
	Bouligny	La.
	Bateman	N.J.
	Rodney	Del.

Twentieth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Branch Chmn	N.C.
	Bateman	N.J.
	Bouligny	La.
	Willey	Conn.
	Barnard	Pa.

Twentieth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Bouligny, Chmn	La.
	Bateman	N.J.
	Willey	Conn.
	Marks	Pa.
	Chambers	Md.

Twenty-first Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Marks, chmn	Pa.
	Willey	Conn.
	Noble	Ind.
	McLean	Ill.
	Seymour	Vt.

Twenty-first Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Marks, Chmn	Pa.
	Willey	Conn.
	Noble	Ind.
	Brown	N.C.
	Seymour	Vt.

Twenty-second Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Seymour, Chmn	Vt.
	Brown	N.C.
	Hanna	Ohio
	Moore	Ala.
	Waggaman	La.

Twenty-second Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Seymour, Chmn	Vt.
	Brown	N.C.
	Waggaman	La.
	Robinson	Ill.
	Foot	Conn.

Twenty-third Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Brown, Chmn	N.C.
	Robinson	Ill.
	Kent	Md.
	Wright	N.Y.
	Swift	Vt.

Twenty-third Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Brown, Chmn	N.C.
	Kent	Md.
	Swift	Vt.
	Robinson	Ill.
	Morris	Ohio

Twenty-fourth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Brown, Chmn	N.C.
	Kent	Md.
	King	Ala.
	Morris	Ohio
	Wright	N.Y.

Twenty-fourth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Page, Chmn	N.H.
	Morris	Ohio
	Kent	Md.
	McKean	Pa.
	Clay	Ky.

Twenty-fifth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Smith, Chmn	Conn.
	Spence	Md.
	Linn	Mo.
	McKean	Pa.
	Black	Miss.

Twenty-fifth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Smith, Chmn	Conn.
	Spence	Md.
	Linn	Mo.
	McKean	Pa.
	Black	Miss.

Twenty-fifth Cong., Third Sess.

Messrs.	Smith, Chmn	Conn.
	Spence	Md.
	Linn	Mo.
	McKean	Pa.
	Mouton	La.

Twenty-sixth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Mouton, Chmn	La.
	Spence	Md.
	Linn	Mo.
	Brown	N.C.
	Smith	Conn.

Twenty-sixth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Mouton, Chmn	La.
	Dixon	R.I.
	Linn	Mo.
	Sturgeon	Pa.
	Smith	Conn.

* In 1884, the Senate Committee on Agriculture's name was changed to Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In 1977, the Committee's name was again changed to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Twenty-seventh Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Linn, Chmn	Mo.
Woodbridge	Mich.
Smith	Conn.
White	Ind.
Simmons	R.I.

Twenty-seventh Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Linn, Chmn	Mo.
Bates	Mass.
Barrow	La.
Smith	Conn.
Sturgeon	Pa.

Twenty-seventh Cong., Third Sess.

Messrs. Linn, Chmn	Mo.
Bates	Mass.
Crafts	Vt.
Smith	Conn.
Sturgeon	Pa.

Twenty-eight Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Upham, Chmn	Vt.
Bates	Mass.
Sturgeon	Pa.
Semple	Ill.
Atchison	Mo.

Twenty-eight Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Upham, Chmn	Vt.
Bates	Mass.
Sturgeon	Pa.
Semple	Ill.
Atchison	Mo.

Twenty-ninth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Sturgeon, Chmn	Pa.
Semple	Ill.
Phelps	Vt.
Turney	Tenn.
Corwin	Ohio

Twenty-ninth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Sturgeon, Chmn	Pa.
Semple	Ill.
Upham	Vt.
Turney	Tenn.
Cilley	N.H.

Thirtieth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Sturgeon, Chmn	Pa.
Turney	Tenn.
Spruance	Del.
Atherton	N.H.
Corwin	Ohio.

Thirtieth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Sturgeon, Chmn	Pa.
Turney	Tenn.
Spruance	Del.
Atherton	N.H.
Corwin	Ohio.

Thirty-first Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Sturgeon, Chmn	Pa.
Turney	Tenn.
Spruance	Del.
Walker	Wis.
Corwin	Ohio.

Thirty-first Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Sturgeon, Chmn	Pa.
Turney	Tenn.
Spruance	Del.
Walker	Wis.
Chase	Ohio.

Thirty-second Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Soulé, Chmn	La.
Walker	Wis.
Atchison	Mo.
Spruance	Del.
Wade	Ohio

Thirty-second Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Soulé, Chmn	La.
Atchison	Mo.
Spruance	Del.
Wade	Ohio
Hale	N.H.

Thirty-third Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Allen, Chmn	R.I.
Hunter	Va.
Wade	Ohio
Thomson	N.J.
Morton	Fla.

Thirty-third Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Allen, Chmn	R.I.
Hunter	Va.
Wade	Ohio
Thomson	N.J.
Morton	Fla.

Thirty-fourth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Allen, Chmn	R.I.
Hunter	Va.
Wade	Ohio
Thomson	N.J.
Harlan	Iowa

Thirty-fourth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Allen, Chmn	R.I.
Hunter	Va.
Wade	Ohio
Thomson	N.J.
Harlan	Iowa

Thirty-fourth Cong., Third Sess.

Messrs. Allen, Chmn	R.I.
Hunter	Va.
Wade	Ohio
Thomson	N.J.
Harlan	Iowa

(No committee existed in 35th, 36th and 37th Congresses)

Thirty-eighth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Sherman, Chmn	Ohio
Harlan	Iowa
Wilson	Mass.
Lane	Kans.
Powell	Ky.

Thirty-eighth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Lane, Chmn	Kans.
Harlan	Iowa
Wilson	Mass.
Farwell	Maine
Powell	Ky.

Thirty-ninth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Sherman, Chmn	Ohio
Lane	Kans.
Creswell	Md.
Cowan	Pa.
Guthrie	Ky.

Thirty-ninth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Sherman, Chmn	Ohio
Cattell	N.J.
Wilson	Mass.
Cowan	Pa.
Guthrie	Ky.

Fortieth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Cameron, Chmn	Pa.
	Cattell	N.J.
	Morton	Ind.
	Tipton	Nebr.
	Guthrie	Ky.

Fortieth Cong., Second Sess.

No Directory Available

Fortieth Cong., Third Sess.

Messrs.	Cameron, Chmn	Pa.
	Cattell	N.J.
	Tipton	Nebr.
	Welch	Fla.
	McCreery	Ky.

Forty-first Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Cameron, Chmn	Pa.
	Robertson	S.C.
	Tipton	Nebr.
	Gilbert	Fla.
	McCreery	Ky.

Forty-first Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Cameron, Chmn	Pa.
	Robertson	S.C.
	Tipton	Nebr.
	Gilbert	Fla.
	McCreery	Ky.

Forty-second Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Morton, Chmn	Ind.
	Cameron	Pa.
	Robertson	S.C.
	Tipton	Nebr.
	Davis	W. Va.

Forty-second Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Frelinghuysen, Chmn	N.J.
	Robertson	S.C.
	Lewis	Va.
	Davis	W. Va.
	Cragin	N.H.

Forty-second Cong., Third Sess.

Messrs.	Frelinghuysen, Chmn	N.J.
	Robertson	S.C.
	Lewis	Va.
	Davis	W. Va.
	Machen	Ky.

Forty-third Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Frelinghuysen, Chmn	N.J.
	Robertson	S.C.
	Lewis	Va.
	Dennis	Md.
	Gordon	Ga.

Forty-third Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Frelinghuysen, Chmn	N.J.
	Robertson	S.C.
	Lewis	Va.
	Dennis	Md.
	Gordon	Ga.

Forty-fourth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Frelinghuysen, Chmn	N.J.
	Robertson	S.C.
	Harvey	Kans.
	Davis	W. Va.
	Gordon	Ga.

Forty-fourth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Frelinghuysen, Chmn	N.J.
	Robertson	S.C.
	Harvey	Kans.
	Davis	W. Va.
	Gordon	Ga.

Forty-fifth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Paddock, Chmn	Nebr.
	Sharon	Nev.
	Hoar	Mass.
	Davis	W. Va.
	Gordon	Ga.

Forty-fifth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Paddock, Chmn	Nebr.
	Sharon	Nev.
	Hoar	Mass.
	Davis	W. Va.
	Gordon	Ga.

Forty-fifth Cong., Third Sess.

Messrs.	Paddock, Chmn	Nebr.
	Sharon	Nev.
	Hoar	Mass.
	Davis	W. Va.
	Gordon	Ga.

Forty-sixth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Johnson, Chmn	Va.
	Davis	W. Va.
	Gordon	Ga.
	Slater	Oreg.
	Paddock	Nebr.
	Sharon	Nev.

Forty-sixth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Johnson, Chmn	Va.
	Davis	W. Va.
	Gordon	Ga.
	Slater	Oreg.
	Paddock	Nebr.
	Sharon	Nev.
	Blair	N.H.

Forty-sixth Cong., Third Sess.

Messrs.	Johnson, Chmn	Va.
	Davis	W. Va.
	Slater	Oreg.
	Brown	Ga.
	Paddock	Nebr.
	Sharon	Nev.
	Blair	N.H.

Forty-seventh Cong., Spec. Sess.

Messrs.	Mahone, Chmn	Va.
	Blair	N.H.
	Plumb	Kans.
	Van Wyck	Nebr.
	Davis	W. Va.
	Slater	Oreg.
	George	Miss.

Forty-seventh Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Mahone, Chmn	Va.
	Blair	N.H.
	Plumb	Kans.
	Van Wyck	Nebr.
	Davis	W. Va.
	Slater	Oreg.
	George	Miss.

Forty-seventh Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Mahone, Chmn	Va.
	Blair	N.H.
	Plumb	Kans.
	Van Wyck	Nebr.
	Davis	W. Va.
	Slater	Oreg.
	George	Miss.

Forty-eighth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Miller, Chmn	N.Y.
	Blair	N.H.
	Plumb	Kans.

Forty-eighth Cong., First Sess.—Continued

	Van Wyck	Nebr.
	George	Miss.
	Williams	Ky.
	Fair	Nev.

Forty-eighth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Miller, Chmn	N.Y.
	Blair	N.H.
	Plumb	Kans.
	Van Wyck	Nebr.
	Sawyer	Wis.
	George	Miss.
	Williams	Ky.
	Fair	Nev.
	Gibson	La.

Forty-ninth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Miller, Chmn	N.Y.
	Blair	N.H.
	Plumb	Kans.
	Van Wyck	Nebr.
	Sawyer	Wis.
	George	Miss.
	Fair	Nev.
	Gibson	La.
	Jones	Ark.

Forty-ninth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Miller, Chmn	N.Y.
	Blair	N.H.
	Plumb	Kans.
	Van Wyck	Nebr.
	Sawyer	Wis.
	George	Miss.
	Fair	Nev.
	Gibson	La.
	Jones	Ark.

Fifieth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Palmer, Chmn	Mich.
	Blair	N.H.
	Plumb	Kans.
	Sabin	Minn.
	Paddock	Nebr.
	George	Miss.
	Gibson	La.
	Jones	Ark.
	Bate	Tenn.

Fiftieth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Palmer, Chmn	Mich.
	Blair	N.H.
	Plumb	Kans.
	Sabin	Minn.
	Paddock	Nebr.
	George	Miss.
	Gibson	La.
	Jones	Ark.
	Bate	Tenn.

Fifty-first Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Paddock, Chmn	Nebr.
	Blair	N.H.
	Plumb	Kans.
	Higgins	Del.
	McMillian	Mich.
	George	Miss.
	Gibson	La.
	Jones	Ark.
	Bate	Tenn.

Fifty-first Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Paddock, Chmn	Nebr.
	Blair	N.H.
	Plumb	Kans.
	Higgins	Del.
	McMillan	Mich.
	George	Miss

Fifty-first Cong., Second Sess.—Continued

	Gibson	La.
	Jones	Ark.
	Bate	Tenn.

Fifty-second Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Paddock Chmn	Nebr.
	McMillan	Mich.
	Casey	N. Dak.
	Warren	Wyo.
	Felton	Calif.
	George	Miss.
	Gibson	La.
	Jones	Ark.
	Bate	Tenn.

Fifty-second Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Paddock, Chmn	Nebr.
	McMillan	Mich.
	Casey	N. Dak.
	Warren	Wyo.
	Felton	Calif.
	George	Miss.
	Gibson	La.
	Jones	Ark.
	Bate	Tenn.

Fifty-third Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	George, Chmn	Miss.
	Bate	Tenn.
	Ransom	N.C.
	Peffer	Kans.
	Roach	N. Dak.
	McMillan	Mich.
	Washburn	Minn.
	Proctor	Vt.
	Hansbrough	N. Dak.

Fifty-third Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	George, Chmn	Miss.
	Bate	Tenn.
	Ransom	N.C.
	Peffer	Kans.
	Roach	N. Dak.
	McMillan	Mich.
	Washburn	Minn.
	Proctor	Vt.
	Hansbrough	N. Dak.

Fifty-fourth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Proctor, Chmn	Vt.
	Hansbrough	N. Dak.
	Warren	Wyo.
	Gear	Iowa
	Butler	N.C.
	George	Miss.
	Bate	Tenn.
	Roach	N. Dak.
	Irby	S.C.

Fifty-fourth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Proctor, Chmn	Vt.
	Hansbrough	N. Dak.
	Warren	Wyo.
	Gear	Iowa
	Butler	N.C.
	George	Miss.
	Bate	Tenn.
	Roach	N. Dak.
	Irby	S.C.

Fifty-fifth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Proctor, Chmn	Vt.
	Hansbrough	N. Dak.
	Warren	Wyo.
	Gear	Iowa
	George	Miss.
	Bate	Tenn.

Fifty-fifth Cong., First Sess.—Continued

Roach	N. Dak.
Clay	Ga.
Heitfeld	Idaho

Fifty-fifth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Proctor, Chmn	Vt.
Hansbrough	N. Dak.
Warren	Wyo.
Gear	Iowa
Bate	Tenn.
Roach	N. Dak.
Clay	Ga.
Money	Miss.
Heitfeld	Idaho

Fifty-fifth Cong., Third Sess.

Messrs. Proctor, Chmn	Vt.
Hansbrough	N. Dak.
Warren	Wyo.
Gear	Iowa
Bate	Tenn.
Roach	N. Dak.
Clay	Ga.
Money	Miss.
Heitfeld	Idaho

Fifty-sixth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Proctor, Chmn	Vt.
Hansbrough	N. Dak.
Warren	Wyo.
Gear	Iowa
Foster	Wash.
Bate	Tenn.
Money	Miss.
Heitfeld	Idaho
Allen	Nev.

Fifty-sixth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Proctor, Chmn	Vt.
Hansbrough	N. Dak.
Warren	Wyo.
Dolliver	Iowa
Foster	Wash.
Bate	Tenn.
Money	Miss.
Heitfeld	Idaho
Allen	Nev.

Fifty-seventh Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Proctor, Chmn	Vt.
Hansbrough	N. Dak.
Warren	Wyo.
Foster	Wash.
Dolliver	Iowa
Quarles	Wis.
Quay	Pa.
Bate	Tenn.
Money	Miss.
Heitfeld	Idaho
Simmons	N.C.

Fifty-seventh Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Proctor, Chmn	Vt.
Hansbrough	N. Dak.
Warren	Wyo.
Foster	Wash.
Dolliver	Iowa
Quarles	Wis.
Quay	Pa.
Bate	Tenn.
Money	Miss.
Heitfeld	Idaho
Simmons	N.C.

Fifty-eighth Cong., Spec. Sess.

Messrs. Proctor, Chmn	Vt.
Hansbrough	N. Dak.
Warren	Wyo.

Fifty-eighth Cong., Spec. Sess.—Continued

Foster	Wash.
Dolliver	Iowa
Quarles	Wis.
Quay	Pa.
Bate	Tenn.
Money	Miss.
Simmons	N.C.

Fifty-eighth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Proctor, Chmn	Vt.
Hansbrough	N. Dak.
Warren	Wyo.
Foster	Wash.
Dolliver	Iowa
Quarles	Wis.
Quay	Pa.
Bate	Tenn.
Money	Miss.
Simmons	N.C.

Fifty-eighth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Proctor, Chmn	Vt.
Hansbrough	N. Dak.
Warren	Wyo.
Foster	Wash.
Dolliver	Iowa
Quarles	Wis.
Quay	Pa.
Bate	Tenn.
Money	Miss.
Simmons	N.C.
Latimer	S.C.

Fifty-eighth Cong., Third Sess.

Messrs. Proctor, Chmn	Vt.
Hansbrough	N. Dak.
Warren	Wyo.
Foster	Wash.
Dolliver	Iowa
Quarles	Wis.
Burnham	N.H.
Bate	Tenn.
Money	Miss.
Simmons	N.C.
Latimer	S.C.

Fifty-ninth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Proctor, Chmn	Vt.
Hansbrough	N. Dak.
Warren	Wyo.
Dolliver	Iowa
Burnham	N.H.
Perkins	Calif.
Long	Kans.
Money	Miss.
Simmons	N.C.
Latimer	S.C.
Frazier	Tenn.

Fifty-ninth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Proctor, Chmn	Vt.
Hansbrough	N. Dak.
Warren	Wyo.
Dolliver	Iowa
Burnham	N.H.
Perkins	Calif.
Long	Kans.
Money	Miss.
Simmons	N.C.
Latimer	S.C.
Frazier	Tenn.

Sixtieth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Hansbrough, Chmn	N. Dak.
Warren	Wyo.
Dolliver	Iowa
Burnham	N.H.

Sixtieth Cong., First Sess.—Continued

Perkins	Calif.
Long	Kans.
Burkett	Nebr.
Money	Miss.
Simmons	N.C.
Bankhead	Ala.
Gore	Okla.

Sixtieth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Hansbrough, Chmn	N. Dak.
Warren	Wyo.
Dolliver	Iowa
Burnham	N.H.
Perkins	Calif.
Long	Kans.
Burkett	Nebr.
Money	Miss.
Simmons	N.C.
Bankhead	Ala.
Gore	Okla.

Sixty-first Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Dolliver, Chmn	Iowa
Warren	Wyo.
Burnham	N.H.
Perkins	Calif.
Burkett	Nebr.
Guggenheim	Colo.
Page	Vt.
Johnson	N. Dak.
Money	Miss.
Bankhead	Ala.
Gore	Okla.
Chamberlain	Oreg.
Smith	S.C.

Sixty-first Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Dolliver, Chmn	Iowa
Warren	Wyo.
Burnham	N.H
Perkins	Calif.
Burkett	Nebr.
Guggenheim	Colo.
Page	Vt.
Crawford	S. Dak.
Money	Miss.
Bankhead	Ala.
Gore	Okla.
Chamberlain	Oreg.
Smith	S.C.

Sixty-first Cong., Third Sess.

Messrs. Warren, Chmn	Wyo.
Burnham	N.H.
Perkins	Calif.
Burkett	Nebr.
Guggenheim	Colo.
Page	Vt.
Crawford	S. Dak.

Sixty-second Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Burnham, Chmn	N.H.
Warren	Wyo.
Perkins	Calif.
Guggenheim	Colo.
Page	Vt.
Crawford	S. Dak.
Bradley	Ky.
Lorimer	Ill.
Gronna	N. Dak.
Bankhead	Miss.
Gore	Okla.
Chamberlain	Oreg.
Smith	S.C.
Percy	Miss.
Terrell	Ga.
Lea	Tenn.

Sixty-second Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Burnham, Chmn	N.H.
Warren	Wyo.
Perkins	Calif.
Guggenheim	Colo.
Page	Vt.
Crawford	S. Dak.
Bradley	Ky.
Lorimer	Ill.
Gronna	N. Dak.
Bankhead	Miss.
Gore	Okla.
Chamberlain	Oreg.
Smith	S.C.
Percy	Miss.
Smith	Ga.
Gardner	Maine

Sixty-third Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Gore, Chmn	Okla.
Chamberlain	Oreg.
Smith	S.C.
Smith	Ga.
Sheppard	Tex.
Shafroth	Colo.
Ransdell	La.
Thompson	Kans.
Robinson	Ark.
Warren	Wyo.
Page	Vt.
Crawford	S. Dak.
Bradley	Ky.
Gronna	N. Dak.
Brady	Idaho
Norris	Nebr.

Sixty-third Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Gore, Chmn	Okla.
Chamberlain	Oreg.
Smith	S.C.
Smith	Ga.
Sheppard	Tex.
Shafroth	Colo.
Ransdell	La.
Thompson	Kans.
Robinson	Ark.
Warren	Wyo.
Page	Vt.
Crawford	S. Dak.
Bradley	Ky.
Gronna	N. Dak.
Brady	Idaho
Norris	Nebr.

Sixty-third Cong., Third Sess.

Messrs. Gore, Chmn	Okla.
Chamberlain	Oreg.
Smith	S.C.
Smith	Ga.
Sheppard	Tex.
Shafroth	Colo.
Ransdell	La.
Thompson	Kans.
Robinson	Ark.
Warren	Wyo.
Page	Vt.
Crawford	S. Dak.
Gronna	N. Dak.
Brady	Idaho
Norris	Nebr.
Kenyon	Iowa

Sixty-fourth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs. Gore, Chmn	Okla.
Chamberlain	Oreg.
Smith	S.C.
Smith	Ga.

Sixty-fourth Cong., First Sess.—Continued

	Sheppard	Tex.
	Shafroth	Colo.
	Ransdell	La.
	Thompson	Kans.
	Johnson	S. Dak.
	Warren	Wyo.
	Page	Vt.
	Gronna	N. Dak.
	Brady	Idaho
	Norris	Nebr.
	Kenyon	Iowa
	Wadsworth	N.Y.

Sixty-fourth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Gore, Chmn	Okla.
	Chamberlain	Oreg.
	Smith	S.C.
	Smith	Ga.
	Sheppard	Tex.
	Shafroth	Colo.
	Ransdell	La.
	Thompson	Kans.
	Johnson	S. Dak.
	Warren	Wyo.
	Page	Vt.
	Gronna	N. Dak.
	Brady	Idaho
	Norris	Nebr.
	Kenyon	Iowa
	Wadsworth	N.Y.

Sixty-fifth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Gore, Chmn	Okla.
	Chamberlain	Oreg.
	Smith	S.C.
	Smith	Ga.
	Sheppard	Tex.
	Ransdell	La.
	Thompson	Kans.
	Johnson	S. Dak.
	Kendrick	Wyo.
	Warren	Wyo.
	Page	Vt.
	Gronna	N. Dak.
	Brady	Idaho
	Norris	Nebr.
	Kenyon	Iowa
	Wadsworth	N.Y.

Sixty-fifth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Gore, Chmn	Okla.
	Chamberlain	Oreg.
	Smith	S.C.
	Smith	Ga.
	Sheppard	Tex.
	Ransdell	La.
	Thompson	Kans.
	Johnson	S. Dak.
	Kendrick	Wyo.
	Warren	Wyo.
	Page	Vt.
	Gronna	N. Dak.
	Norris	Nebr.
	Kenyon	Iowa
	Wadsworth	N.Y.
	France	Md.

Sixty-fifth Cong., Third Sess.

Messrs.	Gore, Chmn	Okla.
	Chamberlain	Oreg.
	Smith	S.C.
	Smith	Ga.
	Sheppard	Tex.
	Ransdell	La.
	Thompson	Kans.
	Johnson	S. Dak.
	Kendrick	Wyo.

Sixty-fifth Cong., Third Sess.—Continued

	Warren	Wyo.
	Page	Vt.
	Gronna	N. Dak.
	Norris	Nebr.
	Kenyon	Iowa
	Wadsworth	N.Y.
	France	Md.

Sixty-sixth Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Gronna, Chmn	N. Dak.
	Page	Vt.
	Norris	Nebr.
	Kenyon	Iowa
	Wadsworth	N.Y.
	France	Md.
	McNary	Oreg.
	Capper	Kans.
	Keyes	N.H.
	Gore	Okla.
	Smith	S.C.
	Smith	Ga.
	Ransdell	La.
	Johnson	S. Dak.
	Kendrick	Wyo.
	Harrison	Miss.

Sixty-sixth Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs.	Gronna, Chmn	N. Dak.
	Page	Vt.
	Norris	Nebr.
	Kenyon	Iowa
	Wadsworth	N.Y.
	France	Md.
	McNary	Oreg.
	Capper	Kans.
	Keyes	N.H.
	Gore	Okla.
	Smith	S.C.
	Smith	Ga.
	Ransdell	La.
	Johnson	S. Dak.
	Kendrick	Wyo.
	Harrison	Miss.

Sixty-sixth Cong., Third Sess.

Messrs.	Gronna, Chmn	N. Dak.
	Page	Vt.
	Norris	Nebr.
	Kenyon	Iowa
	Wadsworth	N.Y.
	France	Md.
	McNary	Oreg.
	Capper	Kans.
	Keyes	N.H.
	Gore	Okla.
	Smith	S.C.
	Smith	Ga.
	Ransdell	La.
	Johnson	S. Dak.
	Kendrick	Wyo.
	Harrison	Miss.

Sixty-seventh Cong., First Sess.

Messrs.	Norris, Chmn	Nebr.
	Page	Vt.
	Kenyon	Iowa
	Wadsworth	N.Y.
	McNary	Oreg.
	Capper	Kans.
	Keyes	N.H.
	Gooding	Idaho
	Ladd	N. Dak.
	Norbeck	S. Dak.
	Smith	S.C.
	Ransdell	La.
	Kendrick	Wyo.

Sixty-seventh Cong., First Sess.—Continued

Harrison	Miss.
Heflin	Ala.
Caraway	Ark.

Sixty-seventh Cong., Second Sess.

Messrs. Norris, Chmn	Nebr.
Page	Vt.
Kenyon	Iowa
McNary	Oreg.
Capper	Kans.
Keyes	N.H.
Gooding	Idaho
Ladd	N. Dak.
Norbeck	S. Dak.
Harreld	Okla.
Smith	S.C.
Ransdell	La.
Hendrick	Wyo.
Harrison	Miss.
Heflin	Ala.
Caraway	Ark.

Sixty-seventh Cong., Third Sess.

Messrs. Norris, Chmn	Nebr.
Page	Vt.
McNary	Oreg.
Capper	Kans.
Keyes	N.H.
Gooding	Idaho
Ladd	N. Dak.
Norbeck	S. Dak.
Harreld	Okla.
McKinley	Ill.
Smith	S.C.
Ransdell	La.
Hendrick	Wyo.
Harrison	Miss.
Heflin	Ala.
Caraway	Ark.

Sixty-eighth Congress

Messrs. Norris, Chmn	Nebr.
McNary	Oreg.
Capper	Kans.
Keyes	N.H.
Gooding	Idaho
Ladd	N. Dak.
Norbeck	S. Dak.
Harreld	Okla.
McKinley	Ill.
Smith	S.C.
Ransdell	La.
Kendrick	Wyo.
Harrison	Miss.
Heflin	Ala.
Caraway	Ark.
Ralston	Ind.
Johnson	Minn.

Sixty-ninth Congress

Messrs. McNary, [1] Chmn	Oreg.
Norris [3]	Nebr.
Capper	Kans.
Keyes	N.H.
Gooding	Idaho
——— [4]	
Norbeck	S. Dak.
Harreld	Okla.
Deneen	Ill.
Sackett	Ky.
Smith	S.C.
Ransdell	La.
Kendrick	Wyo.
Heflin	Ala.
Caraway	Ark.
Ferris	Mich.

Sixty-ninth Congress—Continued

Mayfield [3]	Tex.

[1] Appointed chairman Dec. 14, 1926, vice Norris, excused as chairman Dec. 14, 1926.

[2] Resigned as chairman July 3, 1926.

[3] Appointed Dec. 15, 1925, vice Ralston, deceased, Oct. 14, 1925.

[4] Ladd, deceased June 22, 1925.

Seventieth Congress

Messrs. McNary, Chmn	Oreg.
Norris	Nebr.
Capper	Kans.
Norbeck	S. Dak.
Frazier	N. Dak.
Gould	Maine
Thomas [1]	Okla.
Larrazolo [2]	N. Mex.
Smith	S.C.
Ransdell	La.
Kendrick	Wyo.
Heflin	Ala.
Caraway	Ark.
Mayfield	Tex.
Wheeler	Mont.
Thomas	Idaho
Shipstead	Minn.

[1] Appointed Dec. 5, 1928, vice Goodling, deceased, June 24, 1928.

[2] Appointed Dec. 7, 1928, vice Cutting, term expired Dec. 7, 1928, who was appointed May 10, 1928, vice Keyes, excused, May 10, 1928.

Seventy-first Congress

Messrs. McNary, Chmn	Oreg.
Norris	Nebr.
Capper	Kans.
Norbeck	S. Dak.
Frazier	N. Dak.
Gould	Maine
Thomas	Idaho
Hatfield	W. Va.
Townsend	Del.
Walcott	Conn.
Smith	S.C.
Ransdell	La.
Kendrick	Wyo.
Heflin	Ala.
Caraway	Ark.
Wheeler	Mont.
Thomas	Okla.
Shipstead	Minn.

Seventy-second Congress

Messrs. McNary, Chmn	Oreg.
Norris	Nebr.
Capper	Kans.
Norbeck	S. Dak.
Frazier	N. Dak.
Thomas	Idaho
Hatfield	W. Va.
Townsend, Jr	Del.
Walcott	Conn.
Smith	S.C.
Kendrick	Wyo.
Wheeler	Mont.
Thomas	Okla.
McGill	Kans.
Bankhead	Ala.
Bulow	S. Dak.
Mrs. Caraway [1]	Ark.
Mr. Shipstead	Minn.

[1] Elected on Jan. 2, 1932 to fill vacancy caused by death of Thaddeus H. Caraway.

Seventy-third Congress

Messrs.	Smith, Chmn	S.C.
	Wheeler	Mont.
	Thomas	OKla.
	McGill	Kans.
	Bankhead	Ala.
	Bulow	S. Dak.
Mrs.	Caraway	Ark.
Messrs.	Bone	Wash.
	Murphy	Iowa
	Pope	Idaho
	Hatch [1]	N. Mex.
	Norris	Nebr.
	McNary	Oreg.
	Capper	Kans.
	Norbeck	S. Dak.
	Frazier	N. Dak.
	Hatfield	W. Va.
	Cutting	N. Mex.
	Shipstead	Minn.

[1] Appointed Jan. 4, 1934, vice Kendrick, deceased, Nov. 3, 1933.

Seventy-fourth Congress

Messrs.	Smith, Chmn	S.C.
	Wheeler	Mont.
	Thomas	Okla.
	McGill	Kans.
	Bankhead	Ala.
	Bulow	S. Dak.
Mrs.	Caraway	Ark.
Messrs.	Murphy	Iowa
	Pope	Idaho
	Hatch	N. Mex.
	Bilbo	Miss.
	Moore	N.J.
	Schwellenbach	Wash.
	Norris	Nebr.
	NcNary	Oreg.
	Capper	Kans.
	Norbeck	S. Dak.
	Frazier	N. Dak.
	Shipstead	Minn.

Seventy-fifth Congress

Messrs.	Smith, Chmn	S.C.
	Wheeler	Mont.
	Thomas	Okla.
	McGill	Kans.
	Bankhead	Ala.
	Bulow	S. Dak.
Mrs.	Caraway	Ark.
Messrs.	Pope	Idaho
	Hatch	N. Mex.
	Bilbo	Miss.
	Schwellenbach	Wash.
	Gillette	Iowa
	Ellender	La.
	Milton [1]	N.J.
	Norris	Nebr.
	McNary	Oreg.
	Capper	Kans.
	Frazier	N. Dak.
	Shipstead	Minn.

[1] Appointed Feb. 2, 1938, vice Moore, resigned Jan. 18, 1938.

Seventy-sixth Congress

Messrs.	Smith, Chmn	S.C.
	Wheeler	Mont.
	Thomas	Okla.
	Bankhead	Ala.
	Bulow	S. Dak.
Mrs.	Caraway	Ark.
Messrs.	Hatch	N. Mex.
	Bilbo	Miss.
	Gillette	Iowa

Seventy-sixth Congress—Continued

	Ellender	La.
	Minton	Ind.
	Lucas	Ill.
	Stewart [1]	Tenn.
	Norris	Nebr.
	McNary	Oreg.
	Capper	Kans.
	Frazier	N. Dak.
	Shipstead	Minn.
	Gibson, Jr. [2]	Vt.

[1] Appointed Jan. 16, 1939. Vacancy left open on reorganization.

[2] Appointed July 8, 1940, vice Wiley, excused July 8, 1940.

Seventy-seventh Congress

Messrs.	Smith, Chmn	S.C.
	Wheeler	Mont.
	Thomas	Okla.
	Bankhead	Ala.
	Bulow	S. Dak.
Mrs.	Caraway	Ark.
Messrs.	Hatch	N. Mex.
	Bilbo	Miss.
	Gillette	Iowa
	Ellender	La.
	Lucas	Ill.
	Stewart	Tenn.
	Russell	Ga.
	Norris	Nebr.
	McNary	Oreg.
	Capper	Kans.
	Shipstead	Minn.
	Willis	Ind.
	Aiken	Vt.

Seventy-eighth Congress

Messrs.	Thomas, [1] Chmn	Okla.
	Wheeler	Mont.
	Bankhead	Ala.
Mrs.	Caraway	Ark.
Messrs.	Hatch	N. Mex.
	Bilbo	Miss.
	Gillette	Iowa
	Ellender	La.
	Lucas	Ill.
	Stewart	Tenn.
	Russell	Ga.
	Capper	Kans.
	Willis	Ind.
	Aiken	Vt.
	Nye	N. Dak.
	Millikin	Colo.
	Bushfield	S. Dak.
	Wilson [2]	Iowa

[1] Appointed chairman Nov. 22, 1944, vice Smith, deceased Nov. 17, 1944.

[2] Appointed Apr. 28, 1944, vice McNary, deceased Feb. 25, 1944.

Seventy-ninth Congress

Messrs.	Thomas, Chmn	Okla.
	Wheeler	Mont.
	Bilbo	Miss.
	Ellender	La.
	Lucas	Ill.
	Stewart	Tenn.
	Russell	Ga.
	Connally	Tex.
	Downey	Calif.
	Hoey	N.C.
	Swift [1]	Ala.
	Capper	Kans.
	Shipstead	Minn.
	Willis	Ind.

Seventy-ninth Congress—Continued

Aiken	Vt.
Bushfield	S. Dak.
Wilson	Iowa
Butler	Nebr.
Young[2]	N. Dak.
Knowland[3]	Calif.

[1] Appointed July 2, 1946, vice Bankhead, deceased June 12, 1946.

[2] Appointed Apr. 5, 1945, vice Moses, deceased Mar. 3, 1945. Transfer from majority.

[3] Appointed Dec. 18, 1945, vice Cordon, excused Dec. 18, 1945.

Eightieth Congress

Messrs. Capper, Chmn	Kans.
Aiken	Vt.
Wilson	Iowa
Young	N. Dak.
Thye[1]	Minn.
Kem	Mo.
———[2]	
Thomas	Okla.
Ellender	La.
Lucas	Ill.
Stewart	Tenn.
Hoey	N.C.
Pepper	Fla.

[1] Seniority changed Dec. 15, 1947.

[2] Bushfield, deceased, Sept. 27, 1948.

Eighty-first Congress

Messrs. Thomas, Chmn	Okla.
Ellender	La.
Lucas	Ill.
Hoey	N.C.
Johnston	S.C.
Holland	Fla.
Gillette	Iowa
Anderson	N. Mex.
Aiken	Vt.
Young	N. Dak.
Thye	Minn.
Kem	Mo.
Hickenlooper	Iowa

Eighty-second Congress

Messrs. Ellender, Chmn	La.
Hoey	N.C.
Johnston	S.C.
Holland	Fla.
Anderson	N. Mex.
Eastland	Miss.
Humphrey	Minn.
Aiken	Vt.
Young	N. Dak.
Thye	Minn.
Kem	Mo.
Hickenlooper	Iowa
Mundt	S. Dak.

Eighty-third Congress

Messrs. Aiken, Chmn	Vt.
Young	N. Dak.
Thye	Minn.
Hickenlooper	Iowa
Mundt	S. Dak.
Williams	Del.
Schoeppel	Kans.
Welker	Idaho
Ellender	La.
Johnston	S.C.
Holland	Fla.
Anderson	N. Mex.
Eastland	Miss.
Clements[1]	Ky.
Humphrey	Minn.

[1] Appointed May 18, 1954, vice Hoey, deceased May 12, 1954.

Eighty-fourth Congress

Messrs. Ellender, Chmn	La.
Johnston	S.C.
Holland	Fla.
Eastland	Miss.
Clements	Ky.
Humphrey	Minn.
Scott	N.C.
Symington[1]	Mo.
Aiken	Vt.
Young	N. Dak.
Thye	Minn.
Hickenlooper	Iowa.
Mundt	S. Dak.
Williams	Del.
Schoeppel	Kans.

[1] Appointed Mar. 29, 1956, vice Anderson, who was appointed Jan. 10, 1949, and excused Mar. 22, 1956.

Eighty-fifth Congress

Messrs. Ellender, Chmn	La.
Johnston	S.C.
Holland	Fla.
Eastland	Miss.
Humphrey	Minn.
Symington	Mo.
Talmadge	Ga.
Proxmire[1]	Wis.
Aiken	Vt.
Young	N. Dak.
Thye	Minn.
Hickenlooper	Iowa.
Mundt	S. Dak.
Williams	Del.
Schoeppel	Kans.

[1] Appointed Apr. 21, 1958, vice Scott, who was appointed Jan. 11, 1955, and deceased Apr. 16, 1958.

Eighty-sixth Congress

Messrs. Ellender, Chmn	La.
Johnston	S.C.
Holland	Fla.
Eastland	Miss.
Humphrey	Minn.
Symington	Mo.
Talmadge	Ga.
Proxmire	Wis.
Jordan	N.C.
Young	Ohio
Hart	Mich.
Aiken	Vt.
Young	N. Dak.
Hickenlooper	Iowa
Mundt	S. Dak.
Schoeppel	Kans.
Cooper[1]	Ky.

[1] Appointed Jan. 18, 1960, vice Williams, Del., who was appointed Jan. 13, 1953 (S. Res. 251, 86th, 2d).

Eighty-seventh Congress

Messrs. Ellender, Chmn	La.
Johnston	S.C.
Holland	Fla.
Eastland	Miss.
Talmadge	Ga.
Proxmire	Wis.
Jordan	N.C.
Young	Ohio
Hart	Mich.
McCarthy	Minn.
Mrs. Neuberger	Oreg.
Messrs. Aiken	Vt.
Young	N. Dak.
Hickenlooper	Iowa.
Mundt	S. Dak.
Cooper	Ky.

Eighty-seventh Congress—Continued

Boggs	Del.

Eighty-eighth Congress

Messrs. Ellender, Chmn	La.
Johnston	S.C.
Holland	Fla.
Eastland	Miss.
Talmadge	Ga.
Jordan	N.C.
McCarthy	Minn.
Mrs. Neuberger	Oreg.
Messrs. McGovern	S. Dak.
Edmondson[1]	Okla.
Walters[2]	Tenn.
Aiken	Vt.
Young	N. Dak.
Hickenlooper	Iowa
Cooper	Ky.
Boggs	Del.
Mechem[3]	N. Mex.

[1] Term expired Nov. 3, 1964.

[2] Appointed Aug. 27, 1963, vice Proxmire; Mr. Walters' term expired Nov. 3, 1964.

[3] Term expired Nov. 3, 1964.

Eighty-ninth Congress

Messrs. Ellender, Chmn	La.
Johnston[1]	S.C.
Holland	Fla.
Eastland	Miss.
Talmadge	Ga.
Jordan	N.C.
McCarthy[2]	Minn.
McGovern	S. Dak.
Bass	Tenn.
Montoya	N. Mex.
Mondale[3]	Minn.
Russell[4,5]	S.C.
Aiken	Vt.
Young	N. Dak.
Cooper	Ky.
Boggs	Del.
Miller	Iowa

[1] Deceased Apr. 18, 1965.

[2] Excused from Committee Apr. 26, 1965.

[3] Appointed to Committee Apr. 26, 1965, vice McCarthy.

[4] Appointed to Committee Apr. 26, 1965, vice Johnston.

[5] Term expired Nov. 8, 1966, during adjournment, not replaced.

Ninetieth Congress

Messrs. Ellender, Chmn	La.
Eastland	Miss.
Talmadge	Ga.
Jordan	N.C.
McGovern	S. Dak.
Montoya	N. Mex.
Mondale	Minn.
Byrd	Va.
Hollings	S.C.
Aiken	Vt.
Young	N. Dak.
Boggs	Del.
Miller	Iowa
Goodell[1]	N.Y.

[1] Senator Goodell was appointed to the Committee on Sept. 12, 1968, vice Senator Mark O. Hatfield of Oregon.

Ninety-first Congress

Messrs. Ellender, Chmn	La.
Holland	Fla.
Eastland	Miss.

Ninety-first Congress—Continued

Talmadge	Ga.
Jordan	N.C.
McGovern	S. Dak.
Allen	Ala.
Aiken	Vt.
Young	N. Dak.
Miller	Iowa
Curtis	Nebr.
Dole	Kans.
Bellmon[1]	Okla.

[1] Appointed on September 17, 1969 to fill vacancy caused by the resignation of Marlow W. Cook (R/KY) to accept another committee assignment.

Ninety-second Congress

Messrs. Talmadge, Chmn	Ga.
Eastland	Miss.
Jordan	N.C.
McGovern	S. Dak.
Allen	Ala.
Humphrey	Minn.
Chiles	Fla.
Mrs. Edwards[1]	La.
Messrs. Miller	Iowa
Aiken	Vt.
Young	N. Dak.
Curtis	Nebr.
Dole	Kans.
Bellmon	Okla.

[1] Elected on August 7, 1972 to fill a vacancy caused by the death of Allen J. Ellender (D-LA).

Ninety-third Congress

Messrs. Talmadge, Chmn	Ga.
Eastland	Miss.
McGovern	S. Dak.
Allen	Ala.
Humphrey	Minn.
Huddleston	Ky.
Clark	Iowa
Curtis	Nebr.
Aiken	Vt.
Young	N. Dak.
Dole	Kans.
Bellmon	Okla.
Helms	N.C.

Ninety-fourth Congress

Messrs. Talmadge, Chmn	Ga.
Eastland	Miss.
McGovern	S. Dak.
Allen	Ala.
Humphrey	Minn.
Huddleston	Ky.
Clark	Iowa
Stone	Fla.
Leahy	Vt.
Dole	Kans.
Young	N. Dak.
Curtis	Nebr.
Bellmon	Okla.
Helms	N.C.

Ninety-fifth Congress

Messrs. Talmadge, Chmn	Ga.
Eastland	Miss.
McGovern	S. Dak.
Huddleston	Ky.
Clark	Iowa
Stone	Fla.
Leahy	Vt.
Zorinsky	Nebr.
Melcher	Mont.
Hodges[1]	Ark.
Mrs. Allen[2]	Ala.

Ninety-fifth Congress—Continued

Messrs.	Dole	Kans.
	Young	N. Dak.
	Curtis	Nebr.
	Bellmon	Okla.
	Helms	N.C.
	Hayakawa	Calif.
	Lugar	Ind.

[1] Appointed on January 27, 1978 to fill vacancy caused by the death of Hubert H. Humphrey.

[2] Elected July 11, 1978 to fill vacancy caused by the death of James B. Allen.

Ninety-sixth Congress

Messrs.	Talmadge, Chmn	Ga.
	McGovern	S. Dak.
	Huddleston	Ky.
	Stone	Fla.
	Leahy	Vt.
	Zorinsky	Nebr.
	Melcher	Mont.
	Stewart	Ala.
	Pryor	Ark.
	Boren	Okla.
	Helms	N.C.
	Young	N. Dak.
	Dole	Kans.
	Hayakawa	Calif.
	Lugar	Ind.
	Cochran	Miss.
	Boschwitz	Minn.
	Jepsen	Iowa

Ninety-seventh Congress

Messrs.	Helms, Chmn	N.C.
	Dole	Kans.
	Hayakawa	Calif.
	Lugar	Ind.
	Cochran	Miss.
	Boschwitz	Minn.
	Jepsen	Iowa
Mrs.	Hawkins	Fla.
Messrs.	Andrews	N. Dak.
	Hatch	Utah
	Huddleston	Ky.
	Leahy	Vt.
	Zorinsky	Nebr.
	Melcher	Mont.
	Pryor	Ark.
	Boren	Okla.
	Dixon	Ill.
	Heflin	Ala.

Ninety-eighth Congress

Messrs.	Helms, Chmn	N.C.
	Dole	Kans.
	Lugar	Ind.
	Cochran	Miss.
	Boschwitz	Minn.
	Jepsen	Iowa
Mrs.	Hawkins	Fla.
Messrs.	Andrews	N. Dak.
	Wilson	Calif.
	Hatch	Utah
	Huddleston	Ky.
	Leahy	Vt.
	Zorinsky	Nebr.
	Melcher	Mont.
	Pryor	Ark.
	Boren	Okla.
	Dixon	Ill.
	Heflin	Ala.

CHAIRMEN OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY, 1825–1986 [1]

Senator	State	Congress	Date appointed	Session dates
Findlay, William	Pennsylvania	19th, 1st	Dec. 12, 1825	Dec. 5, 1825–May 22, 1826.
Willey, Calvin	Connecticut	19th, 2d	Dec. 11, 1826	Dec. 4, 1826–Mar. 3, 1827.
Branch, John	North Carolina	20th, 1st	Dec. 10, 1827	Dec. 3, 1827–May 26, 1828.
Bateman, Ephraim [2]	New Jersey	20th, 2d	Dec. 8, 1828	Dec. 1, 1828–Jan. 12, 1829.
Marks, William	Pennsylvania	21st, 1st [3]	Dec. 9, 1829	Dec. 7, 1829–May 31, 1830.
		21st, 2d	Dec. 7, 1830	Dec. 6, 1830–Mar. 3, 1831.
Seymour, Horatio	Vermont	22d, 1st	Dec. 6, 1831	Dec. 5, 1831–July 16, 1832.
		22d, 2d	Dec. 10, 1832	Dec. 3, 1832–Mar. 2, 1833.
Brown, Bedford	North Carolina	23d, 1st	Dec. 16, 1833	Dec. 2, 1833–June 30, 1834.
		23d, 2d	Dec. 11, 1834	Dec. 1, 1834–Mar. 3, 1835.
		24th, 1st	Dec. 16, 1835	Dec. 7, 1835–July 4, 1836.
Page, John	New Hampshire	24th, 2d	Dec. 12, 1836	Dec. 5, 1836–Mar. 3, 1837.
		25th, special	Mar. 6, 1837 [4]	Mar. 4–10, 1837.
Smith, Perry	Connecticut	25th, 1st	Sept. 8, 1937	Sept 4–Oct. 16, 1837.
		25th, 2d	Dec. 7, 1837	Dec. 4, 1837–July 9, 1838.
		25th, 3d	Dec. 6, 1838	Dec. 3, 1838–Mar. 3, 1839.
Mouton, Alexander	Louisiana	26th, 1st	Dec. 16, 1839	Dec. 2, 1839–July 13, 1840.
		26th, 2d	Dec. 10, 1840	Dec. 7, 1840–Mar. 3, 1841.
Linn, Lewis Fields [5]	Missouri	27th, 1st [3]	June 2, 1841	May 31, 1841–Sept. 13, 1841.
		27th, 2d	Dec. 14, 1841	Dec. 6, 1841–Aug. 31, 1842.
		27th, 3d	Dec. 12, 1842	Dec. 5, 1842–Mar. 3, 1843.
Upham, William	Vermont	28th, 1st	Dec. 11, 1843	Dec., 4, 1843–June 17, 1844.
		28th, 2d	Dec. 9, 1844	Dec. 2, 1844–Mar. 3, 1845.
Sturgeon, Daniel	Pennsylvania	29th, special	Mar. 10, 1845	Mar. 4–20, 1845.
		29th, 1st	Dec. 9, 1845	Dec. 1, 1845–Aug. 10, 1846.
		29th, 2d	Dec. 14, 1846	Dec. 7, 1846–Mar. 3, 1847.
		30th, 1st	Dec. 13, 1847	Dec. 6, 1847–Aug. 14, 1848.
		30th, 2d	Dec. 12, 1848	Dec. 4, 1848–Mar. 3, 1849.
		31st, special	Mar. 7, 1849 [4]	Mar. 5–23, 1849.
		31st, 1st	Dec. 18, 1849	Dec. 3, 1849–Sept. 30, 1850.
		31st, 2d	Dec. 4, 1850	Dec. 2, 1850–Mar. 3, 1851.
		32d, special	Mar. 4, 1851 [4]	Mar. 4–13, 1851.
Soulé, Pierre [7]	Louisiana	32d, 1st [4]	Dec. 8, 1851	Dec. 1, 1851–Aug. 31, 1852.
		32d, 2d	Dec. 13, 1852	Dec. 6, 1852–Mar. 3, 1853.
Allen, Phillip	Rhode Island	33d, 1st [6]	Dec. 12, 1853	Dec. 5, 1853–Aug. 7, 1854.
		33d. 2d [4]	Dec. 5, 1854	Dec. 4, 1854–Mar. 3, 1855.
		34th, 1st	Dec. 12, 1855	Dec. 3, 1855–Aug. 18, 1856.
		34th, 2d	Aug. 21, 1856 [4]	Aug. 21–30, 1856.
		34th, 3d	Dec. 8, 1856	Dec. 1, 1856–Mar. 3, 1857.

[1] The creation of a Standing Committee on Agriculture was authorized by the Senate on Dec. 9, 1825, and appointed on Dec. 12, 1825. From the 35th Congress through the 37th Congress, no Committee on Agriculture was authorized. In the amendment of rule 34 on May 9, 1857, the Committee on Agriculture was dropped from the list of standing committees and was not again authorized until Mar 6, 1863.

[2] Senator Bateman resigned from the Senate on Jan. 12, 1829.

[3] There was no reference to appointment of committees in the Journal of the special session of the 21st Congress (Mar. 4–17, 1829) or the 27th Congress (Mar. 4–15, 1841).

[4] In the special sessions of the 25th, 31st, and 32d Congresses, and the second sessions of the 33d and 34th Congresses, the committees as constituted at the end of the preceding session were continued, on the dates noted.

[5] Senator Linn died Oct. 31, 1843, prior to the convening of the 28th Congress.

[6] In the special session of the 33d Congress, the Senate appointed committees, but the Committee on Agriculture does not appear on the list in the Journal, though it is referred to in the index to the Journal.

[7] Senator Soulé resigned from the Senate on Apr. 11, 1853, to accept appointment as U.S. Minister to Spain.

Source: Senate Journals and the Congressional Record.

Name	Party	State	Congress, session [1]	Elected chairman	Served as chairman until [2]—
Sherman, John	Republican	Ohio	38th, special	Mar. 6, 1863	Mar. 14, 1863 (end of session).
			38th, 1st	Dec. 14, 1863	July 14, 1864 (end of session).
Lane, James H	do	Kansas	38th, 2d	Dec. 8, 1864	Mar. 3, 1865 (end of session).
Sherman, John	do	Ohio	39th, special	Mar. 8, 1865	Mar. 11, 1865 (end of session).
			39th, 1st	Dec. 6, 1865	July 28, 1866 (end of session).
			39th, 2d	Dec. 5, 1866	Mar. 3, 1867 (end of session).
Cameron, Simon	do	Pennsylvania	40th, 1st and special	Mar. 7, 1867	Dec. 2, 1867 (end of session).
			40th, 2d	Dec. 3, 1867	Nov. 10, 1868 (end of session).
			40th, 3d	Dec. 10, 1868	Mar. 3, 1869 (end of session).
			41st, 1st	Mar. 8, 1869	Apr. 10, 1869 (end of session).
			41st, special	Apr. 12, 1869	Apr. 22, 1869 (end of session).
			41st, 2d	Dec. 8, 1869	July 15, 1870 (end of session).
			41st, 3d	Dec. 8, 1870	Mar. 3, 1871 (end of session).
Morton, Oliver H.P.T	do	Indiana	42d, 1st	Mar. 10, 1871	Apr. 20, 1871 (end of session).
			42d, special	May 10, 1871	May 27, 1871 (end of session).
Frelinghuysen, Frederick T	do	New Jersey	42d, 2d	Dec. 12, 1871	June 10, 1872 (end of session).
			42d, 3d	Dec. 6, 1872	Mar. 3, 1873 (end of session).
			43d, special	Mar. 12, 1873	Mar. 26, 1873 (end of session).
			43d, 1st	Dec. 4, 1873	June 23, 1874 (end of session).
			43d, 2d	Dec. 9, 1874	Mar. 3, 1875 (end of session).
			44th, special	Mar. 9, 1875	Mar. 24, 1875 (end of session).
			44th, 1st	Dec. 9, 1875	Aug. 15, 1876 (end of session).
			44th, 2d	Dec. 6, 1876	Mar. 3, 1877 (end of session).
Paddock, Algernon S	do	Nebraska	45th, special	Mar. 9, 1877	Mar. 17, 1877 (end of session).
			45th, 1st	Oct. 15, 1877	Dec. 3, 1877 (end of session).
			45th, 2d	Dec. 6, 1877	June 20, 1878 (end of session).
			45th, 3d	Dec. 3, 1878	Mar. 3, 1879 (end of session).
			42d, 2d	Dec. 7, 1871	Dec. 12, 1871 (when he was excused from the committee, having been elected chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections).
Johnson, John W	Conservative	Virginia	46th, 1st	Mar. 19, 1879	July 1, 1879 (end of session).
			46th, 2d	Dec. 3, 1879	June 18, 1880 (end of session).
			46th, 3d	Dec. 7, 1880	Mar. 3, 1881 (end of session).
Mahone, William	Readjuster	do	47th, 1st special	Mar. 18, 1881	Mar. 20, 1881 (end of session).
			47th, 2d special	Oct. 13, 1881	Oct. 29, 1881 (end of session).
			47th, 1st	Dec. 6, 1881	Aug. 8, 1882 (end of session).
			47th, 2d	Dec. 5, 1882	Mar. 3, 1883 (end of session).
Miller, Warner	Republican	New York	48th	Dec. 10, 1883	Mar. 3, 1885 (end of Congress).
			49th	Mar. 12, 1885	Mar. 3, 1887 (when his term of office expired, he having been an unsuccessful candidate for reelection).
Palmer, Thomas W	do	Michigan	50th	Dec. 12, 1887	Mar. 3, 1889 (when his term of office expired, he not having sought reelection).

Paddock, Algernon S	do	Nebraska	51st–52d	Mar. 12, 1889	Mar. 3, 1893 (when his term of office expired, he not having sought reelection).
George, James Z	Democratic	Mississippi	53d	Mar. 15, 1893	Dec. 30, 1895 (when the chairman was elected by the Republican Senate plurality).
Proctor, Redfield	Republican	Vermont	54th–60th, 1st	Dec. 30, 1895	Mar. 4, 1908 (the date of his death).
Hansbrough, Henry C	do	North Dakota	60th	Mar. 26, 1908	Mar. 3, 1909 (when his term of office expired, he having been an unsuccessful candidate for reelection).
Dolliver, Jonathan P	do	Iowa	61st, 1st and 2d	Mar. 22, 1909	Oct. 15, 1910 (the date of his death).
Warren, Francis E	do	Wyoming	61st, 3d	Oct. 15, 1910	Apr. 28, 1911 (No chairman was elected by the Senate for the session, but Warren as senior Republican member of the committee probably served as chairman until a successor was elected.)
Burnham, Henry E	do	New Hampshire	62d	Apr. 28, 1911	Mar. 3, 1913 (when his term of office expired, he not having sought reelection).
Gore, Thomas P	Democratic	Oklahoma	63d–65th	Mar. 15, 1913	May 28, 1919 (when the chairman was elected by the Republican Senate majority).
Gronna, Asle J	Republican	North Dakota	66th	May 28, 1919	Mar. 3, 1921 (when his term of office expired, he having been an unsuccessful candidate for reelection).
Norris, George W	do	Nebraska	67th–69th, 2d	Apr. 18, 1921	Dec. 14, 1926 (when he resigned as chairman, having been elected chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary).
McNary, Charles L	do	Oregon	69th, 2d–72d	Dec. 14, 1926	Mar. 9, 1933 (when the chairman was elected by the Democratic Senate majority).
Smith, Ellison D	Democratic	South Carolina	73d–78th	Mar. 9, 1933	Nov. 17, 1944 (the date of his death).
Thomas, J.W. Elmer	do	Oklahoma	78th, 2d–79th	Nov. 22, 1944	Jan. 6, 1947 (when the chairman was elected by the Republican Senate majority).
Capper, Arthur	Republican	Kansas	80th	Jan. 6, 1947	Jan. 3, 1949 (when his term of office expired, he not having sought reelection).
Thomas, J.W. Elmer	Democratic	Oklahoma	81st	Jan. 10, 1949	Jan. 3, 1951 (when his term of office expired, he having been an unsuccessful candidate for reelection).
Ellender, Allen J	do	Louisiana	82d	Jan. 15, 1951	Jan. 13, 1953 (when the chairman was elected by the Republican Senate majority).
Aiken, George D	Republican	Vermont	83d	Jan. 13, 1953	Jan. 11, 1955 (when the chairman was elected by the Democratic Senate majority).
Ellender, Allen J	Democratic	Louisiana	84th–90th	Jan. 11, 1955	Jan. 2, 1971 (when he resigned as chairman, having been elected chairman of the Committee on Appropriations).
Talmadge, Herman E	Democratic	Georgia	91st–96th	Jan. 28, 1971	Jan. 2, 1981 (when his term of office expired, he having been an unsuccessful candidate for reelection).
Helms, Jesse	Republican	North Carolina	97th to present	Jan. 3, 1981	

[1] Where Senators continued as chairmen of the committee into a new Congress until a successor was elected, we have not counted his service as chairman in the new Congress in the column headed "Congress, session."

[2] In determining the termination date of a Senator's service as chairman of the committee, prior to the 48th Congress appointment was for the session alone; that is, until sine die adjournment of the session. From the 48th through the 50th Congresses, the committee is here considered to have been in existence only from its appointment in each Congress until the sine die adjournment of the Congress. In the 51st and all succeeding Congresses, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is considered to have continued in existence, with its same personnel and chairmen, until their successors were elected, except of course where a Senator's service terminated by reason of death, resignation, or end of his Senate term.

MEMBERS SERVING 12 YEARS OR MORE ON THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY [1]

Name	Congresses	Dates of committee service	Length of committee service
Young, Milton R. (R-ND)	79th-96th	Apr. 5, 1945-Jan. 3, 1981	35 years, 9 months.
Smith, Ellison D. (D-SC)	61st-78th	Mar. 22, 1909-Nov. 17, 1944	35 years, 8 months.
Ellender, Allen J. (D-LA)	75th-92d	Jan. 8, 1937-July 27, 1972	35 years, 7 months.
Aiken, George D. (R-VT)	77th-93d	Jan. 21, 1941-Jan. 3, 1975	34 years.
Norris, George W. (R-NE)	63d-77th	Mar. 15, 1913-Jan. 3, 1943	29 years, 10 months.
Capper, Arthur (R-KS)	66th-80th	May 28, 1919-Jan. 3, 1949	29 years, 7 months.
Eastland, James O. (D-MS)	82d-95th	Jan. 15, 1951-Dec. 27, 1978	27 years, 11 months.
McNary, Charles L. (R-OR)	66th-78th	May 28, 1919-Feb. 25, 1944	24 years, 9 months.
Warren, Francis E. (R-WY)	54th-65th	Dec. 30, 1895-Jan. 28, 1919	24 years, 1 month.
Talmadge, Herman E. (D-GA)	85th-96th	Jan. 9, 1957-Jan. 3, 1981	24 years.
Thomas, J.W. Elmer (D-OK)	70th-81st	Dec. 13, 1927-Jan. 3, 1951	23 years, 1 month.
Holland, Spessard L. (D-FA)	81st-91st	Jan. 10, 1949-Jan. 3, 1971	22 years.
Shipstead, Henrick (R-MN)	70th-79th	Dec. 13, 1927-Jan. 3, 1947	19 years, 1 month.
Wheeler, Burton K. (D-MT)	70th-79th	Dec. 13, 1927-Jan. 3, 1947	19 years, 1 month.
Ransdell, Joseph E. (D-LA)	63d-71st	Mar. 15, 1913-Mar. 3, 1931	18 years.
McGovern, George S. (D-SD)	88th-96th	Feb. 25, 1963-Jan. 3, 1981	17 years, 10 months.
Bate, William B. (D-TN)	50th-59th	Dec. 12, 1887-Mar. 9, 1905	17 years, 3 months.
Dole, Robert J. (R-KS)	91st-present	Jan. 14, 1969-present	17 years.
George, James Z. (D-MS)	47th-55th	Mar. 18, 1881-Aug. 14, 1897	16 years, 5 months.
Johnston, Olin D. (D-SC)	81st-89th	Jan. 10, 1949-Apr. 18, 1965	16 years, 3 months.
Hickenlooper, Bourke (R-IA)	81st-89th	Jan. 10, 1949-Jan. 15, 1965	16 years.
Hansbrough, Henry C. (R-ND)	53d-60th	Mar. 15, 1893-Mar. 3, 1909	16 years.
Norbeck, Peter (R-SD)	67th-74th	Apr. 18, 1921-Dec. 20, 1936	15 years, 8 months.
Proctor, Redfield (R-VT)	53d-60th	Mar. 15, 1893-Mar. 4, 1908	15 years.
Helms, Jesse (R-NC)	93d-present	Jan. 3, 1973-present	14 years.
Jordan, B. Everett (D-NC)	86th-92d	Jan. 14, 1959-Jan. 3, 1973	14 years.
Page, Carroll S. (R-VT)	61st-67th	Mar. 22, 1909-Mar. 3, 1923	13 years, 11 months.
Money, Hernando de Soto (D-MS)	55th-61st	Dec. 13, 1897-Mar. 3, 1911	13 years, 3 months.
Frazier, Lynn J. (R-ND)	70th-76th	Dec. 13, 1927-Jan. 3, 1941	13 years, 1 month.
Gore, Thomas P. (D-OK)	60th-66th	Mar. 17, 1908-Mar. 3, 1921	13 years.
Caraway, Hattie W. (D-AR)	72d-78th	Jan. 12, 1932-Jan. 3, 1945	13 years.
Mundt, Karl E. (R-SD)	82d-87th	Jan. 15, 1951-Feb. 25, 1963	12 years, 1 month.
Bulow, William J. (D-SD)	72d-77th	Dec. 14, 1931-Jan. 3, 1943	12 years, 1 month.
Lucas, Scott W. (D-IL)	76th-81st	Jan. 10, 1939-Jan. 3 1951	12 years.
Bilbo, Theodore G. (D-MS)	74th-79th	Jan. 7, 1935-Jan. 3, 1947	12 years.

[1] Data current through December 1986. Length of service for Senators serving complete terms of office on the Committee are rounded to the nearest full year. Committee terms abbreviated by death, resignation, or retirement, or which began in mid-session, are rounded to the nearest month.

Sources: U.S. Senate. Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. A brief history of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the United States Senate and landmark agricultural legislation: 1825-1970. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1970. (91st Cong., 2d Sess. S. Doc. 91-107).

For data since 1970: Nelson, Garrison; director. Congressional Committee Project. Burlington, Vt., Polimetric Associates, 1981.

Committee calendars and various issues of the Congressional Record were consulted as well.

AGRICULTURAL POLICY OVERVIEW

Any consideration of the Senate Agriculture Committee's history must center on enactments, because this is the mainstay and measuring rod against which the achievements of a legislative body are considered. Therefore, much of this history concerns itself with legislation.

Present national agricultural policy is not explicitly stated in a single law or even the set of laws and statutes that deal directly with current problems. Rather, it is expressed in the combination of traditions, attitudes, institutions, and laws that change over time. Certainly, the statutes define the limits of Federal intervention in the agricultural sector and can have an important influence over the decisions and behavior of individuals and businessses. But, it should always be remembered that freedom and private initiative are the foundation of America's agriculture. The role of Government has been and continues to be to encourage private initiative and to undertake what the farmer cannot do himself, such as promote basic research, disseminate statistics and information, seek out new markets, counter unfair trade practices of our trading partners, and provide a measure of protection from unpredictable weather and natural disasters.

Not all the legislation discussed here originated in the Senate Committee on Agriculture. For one thing, the jurisdiction of the Committee over the years has changed. Further, part of the agricultural legislation originates in the House of Representatives. However, practically all of the legislation presented here is now within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. Many of today's programs were created by this Committee, and many of them have been amended by this Committee in recent years.

This Nation's agriculture serves as an example of production and marketing success not only to other sectors of the U.S. economy but to the entire world. The credit for success in this sector of the economy belongs to the many farmers, and their suppliers and marketers who have worked hard, taken the risks of investment, and been quick to adopt new technology. But such accomplishments as America's great agricultural productivity do not happen in a vacuum. The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry has helped design and enact programs that have facilitated progress in agriculture so as to help distribute the fruits of progress not only to the consumers of this country but to the entire world.

Recent experience with farm legislation indicates that a nation never reaches a situation when its agricultural policy is fixed and complete. Evolution and change are the only constant factors. Conditions at home and abroad, which agricultural policy is required to meet, are constantly being altered.

Our present system of agricultural laws and institutions is in large part a result of intense efforts by many individuals and groups, during the past century. But it cannot be said that past and existing programs have been able to solve all our far-reaching farm and rural problems. Indeed, many often wonder, and not without cause, whether or not some of the programs created by Congress may have contributed to problems farmers face. The laws will continue to be subject to considerable amendment as well as reauthorization and replacement from time to time as Congress desires. Experience demonstrates that agricultural policies and programs tend to be evolutionary rather than revolutionary. The programs of the present are likely to be part of the foundation for the programs of the future.

Agricultural enactments approved by the Senate Agriculture Committee have contributed to the evolution of a farm sector in which a farm population of just 5.4 million people (2.2 percent of the total population) is able to produce enough food and fiber to provide for the needs of our Nation and supply large quantities for export to more than 100 countries throughout the world. As late as 1930, 23 percent of our civilian labor force was engaged in farming. The total output of 3.2 million farm workers in 1985 is 2.6 times as great as 12.5 million farm workers produced in 1930. Improvements in productivity of farm labor have been even more phenomenal. Recent studies indicate that one hour of farm labor now produces more than 15 times as much food and other crops as it did in 1930. For the same time period, crop production is over 250 percent higher per acre and livestock producing per breeding animal is over 210 percent greater.

Agricultural policy and programs are intended to strengthen and improve family farms and the family farm tradition of agriculture. As one aspect of this effort, Congress, the Department of Agriculture, farmers and agribusiness of the United States, as well as conservation and other leaders have recognized that all have a duty to maintain and, where possible, improve our fertile land for future generations. The programs designed to strengthen family farms also are intended to encourage the farmers to use their land in ways that increase income, while simultaneously assuring a lasting base of soil, timber, and water resources to meet future national needs.

Our agricultural growth can be attributed largely to the fact that over the years the Senate Agriculture Committee and the Congress have endeavored to develop agricultural policy on a nonpartisan basis to ensure enactment of progressive legislation providing for long-range flexible farm programs.

The Committee and the Congress have pursued this course because of the key role agriculture plays in the welfare of the entire

Nation. A healthy agricultural sector is important to consumers because they must be assured of an ample supply of the kinds and qualities of food they desire at fair and reasonable prices. Farmers are producing more than adequate supplies for our 239 million population, plus enough to supply our export markets as well as large donations to reduce hunger in many areas of the world under our Food for Peace program.

Food expenditures require only about 15 percent of disposable personal income on average. Projections for the future indicate that food prices will remain low. As a matter of fact, one of our major problems today is more than an adequate supply of certain foods, which depresses farm prices and incomes.

A strong and viable agricultural sector is also necessary for its contribution to our balance of payments position. Dollar exports of agriculture now exceed imports by a substantial margin. But in order to maintain this desirable relationship, we must maintain a competitive position with other exporting countries. The committee has tried to achieve this through a system of market clearing price supports for many of our basic commodities coupled with payments to farmers in order to compensate them fairly and reasonably for their contribution and compliance with program requirements. A challenge for the future will be to maintain open and fair international trading channels, especially in light of other countries' rapidly expanding production of a number of commodities that compete with U.S. exports.

A strong and viable agricultural sector is essential to the economic condition of our rural areas. The farm population amounts to only about 9 percent of the 59.5 million persons who reside in rural areas. But many, if not most, rural residents depend to a large extent on a viable agricultural sector for their own well-being. And conversely, a growing number of farm households depend on off-farm employment opportunities to supplement their farm earnings.

Although price support legislation for the major commodities has been of prime importance in recent years, attention has also been directed toward improving the total environment of rural residents. Emphasis has been placed on developing rural policies that address economic and environmental concerns in order to make rural America a better place in which to live.

Agricultural policy affects every person in this country in one way or another. Farmers, input suppliers, and processors are most directly affected. But the effects are also felt by nonfarm rural residents, food marketers, consumers, foreign buyers, and recipients of food assistance both in this country and in developing nations. Policy now, as in the past, has been directed toward maintaining a strong and viable agricultural sector because it is in the national interest to do so. A look at history shows a pattern of legislation and policy that is truely landmark in its success in shaping a productive and progressive agriculture. But legislation and policy must continue to change in order to accommodate the many trends in farming technology, the organization and structure of farm enterprises, and more general

changes in rural America, in addition to changes in the national and international economic situation. It is the objective of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry to ensure that Federal agricultural policy continues to provide strength and vitality to the farm sector and food system of this Nation.

LANDMARKS IN AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION

The importance of agriculture to our country's economic development was recognized early in our history. The Senate Agriculture Committee is one of the oldest Committees in Congress, first established in 1825. Our forefathers had the anticipation and courage to provide a sound basis for the development of a highly productive agriculture within the framework of a free enterprise system. Building upon congressional encouragement, technological improvements, and farmer ingenuity, and supported by strong diverse public programs, an agricultural industry has been built that is second to none in the world today.

Public programs have been at the forefront, assisting private enterprise in the American effort to find more productive seeds, more effective tools, and more efficient methods of planting, cultivating, harvesting, and marketing.

Washington and Jefferson were among the first who attempted to solve agricultural problems scientifically through experiments with crops and cultural practices. And President Washington in his first message to Congress recommended the use of public funds to aid agriculture and the establishment of boards to collect and diffuse agricultural information.

One of the earliest legislative acts affecting agriculture was an appropriation in 1839 of $1,000 to be used by the Patent Office to distribute seeds, conduct agricultural investigations, and collect agricultural statistics. The appropriation was used to set up an Agricultural Division in the Patent Office. Subsequent appropriations were intermittent, but in one year alone, over 30,000 packages of seeds were distributed. In addition, agricultural statistics were first gathered in connection with the 1840 census, published in 1842. Subsequently, Congress made annual appropriations for the Patent Office to use for agricultural purposes.

In 1852 the Patent Office employed a chemist, a botanist, and an entomologist to conduct experiments. Two years later a garden plot was obtained to investigate the cultivation of sorghum and tea. Although these efforts appear small, the fact remains that they were important steps into the unchartered field of government assistance.

The Department of Agriculture was created when President Lincoln signed the Department of Agriculture Organic Act, on May 15, 1862. The first commissioner of the Department of Agriculture, Issac Newton, outlined the primary objectives of the new Department as including scientific research and its dissemination. These continued

to be the basic agenda of the Department for the next 70 years and led to its becoming a great research and applied science agency of the Federal Government.

The same year the Department of Agriculture was created, 1862, Congress also passed the Morrill Land-Grant College Act. This legislation, which encouraged States to establish and support colleges that would improve and teach agriculture and mechanical arts, was the beginning of a close partnership between the Federal Government and the States. It was subsequently strengthened by the Hatch Experiment Station Act of 1887, which created experiment stations as departments in the State colleges of agriculture, and the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, which created the cooperative Federal-State Extension Service. In conjunction with the Department's own research program, this system of education, research, and extension became a model of success and has made a number of major contributions to advances in agriculture.

Throughout most of the 1800s the Nation was engaged in westward expansion. The Federal Government encouraged this expansion by giving away or selling much of the public domain at very low prices. The Homestead Act of 1862 was important to the establishment of family farms in the unsettled lands, and the Reclamation Act of 1902 assisted in bringing water to the fertile but dry lands of the West. The Morrill Land-Grant College Act used Federal land donations to States as incentives for initiating agricultural education and research programs. To complement this expansionary effort, the Department of Agriculture acquired and experimented with the introduction of new crops. Farmers adopted labor saving machines, substituting horse power for human power. Mechanization was especially stimulated by the shortage of labor caused by the Civil War.

The great expansion of agricultural land, combined with horse-drawn mechanization of farm equipment and better transportation to industrial population centers, created a commercial agriculture by the latter part of the 19th century. At the same time, problems of excess supply and low commodity prices developed. Farmers saw inequities and monopoly power in the farm input and marketing sectors as being largely responsible for their distressed condition. Cooperative action constituted farmers' early efforts to deal with what they felt to be the political and economic injustices facing them. Farmers organized cooperatives to bargain for them in selling their products, to purchase and manufacture their needed supplies, to provide credit, and even to process raw commodities into finished products.

The Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890 and later the Clayton Act of 1914 accommodated cooperative associations but left a substantial uncertainty about their legal status. The Capper-Volstead Act of 1922, hailed by some as the "Magna Carta" of agriculture, explicitly authorized and sanctioned the elimination of competition among farmers through cooperative association. With this legislation in place, farmers, through their cooperatives, pursued the "orderly marketing" of their crops. Efforts to establish nationwide cooperative

marketing associations failed but the orderly marketing concept persisted.

Congress, with the Farm Loan Act of 1916, made a direct effort to deal with credit problems that had plagued agriculture during most of the 19th century. This important legislation established a system of 12 Federal land banks. The cooperative land bank system became a model for additional cooperative banks, which together now constitute the Farm Credit System, a totally borrower-owned credit system that is the single largest lender to the agricultural sector.

World War I brought a rapid increase in demand for agricultural products and higher prices. But these higher prices were followed by depressed conditions in the 1920s. Many proposals for farm relief were introduced in Congress, and those that passed, such as the McNary-Haugen bill, were vetoed. A compromise was finally achieved with enactment of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929, which established the Federal Farm Board to stabilize commodity prices. The Farm Board's funds were quickly expended without success as it confronted the worsening conditions of the Great Depression.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 combined a much more extensive set of supply management and income support techniques than at any earlier time to provide assistance to the farm sector. The objective was to raise prices to parity levels (parity is equating prices for agricultural products to the changing price of goods outside the agricultural sector) by limiting the flow of products onto the market. Farmers producing major crops that were in surplus entered into contracts to reduce production in return for benefit payments, financed by levies on the processors of farm products.

Important parts of the 1933 Act, including taxes on processors, were found unconstitutional. The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act was intended as a substitute for the invalidated Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1936, but it failed to control production. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 successfully combined supply controls with price supports and became the foundation for today's Federal commodity programs. The authority for farmers to create marketing agreements and orders that was lost in the negated 1933 Act was restored by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. Authority for the marketing orders that today provide for the orderly marketing of many perishable farm products is provided under the 1937 legislation.

The commodity supply controls and price supports were only one part of a very broad assault on the farm depression of the 1930s. During this period, laws were enacted that established many of the institutions, agencies, and programs that serve agriculture and other sectors of the economy today. The Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 established a comprehensive rural development effort in a river basin. The rural electric cooperatives of the Tennessee Valley were the model for a national electrification program, encouraged by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. Soil erosion problems that resulted in the severe dust storms of 1934 stimulated the Congress in 1935 to

direct the establishment of a Soil Conservation Service in the Department of Agriculture. Crops losses caused by the droughts in 1934 and 1936 generated interest in the concept of insurance. The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation was established by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. Supervised credit for low-income farm families was provided by the Resettlement Administration, established in 1935. This agency was redesignated the Farm Security Administration in 1937 and is known today as the Farmers Home Administration.

During the Depression, Congress not only passed legislation assisting farmers, it also provided for food assistance to help meet the nutritional needs of poor people. Food assistance programs also were aimed at diminishing the excess supply of farm products. The high unemployment levels of the Depression created the paradox of hunger side-by-side with the low prices and mounting surpluses of farm products. Under authority of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, large quantities of surplus food were distributed to needy households and to school lunch programs. An experimental food stamp program, initiated in 1939, was suspended in 1943 as a result of conditions created by World War II. Federal assistance to school lunch programs became permanently established by the National School Lunch Act of 1946 and a food stamp program was permanently reestablished by Congress in 1964.

World War II brought an economic revival to the depressed farm sector. Congress, in 1941, raised the mandatory support levels to 85 percent of parity for basic commodities. The so-called Steagall Amendment extended this support to nonbasic commodities and required support be continued for 2 years after hostilities ceased, under the proposition that farmers would have to make postwar adjustments.

The Agricultural Act of 1949 made permanent amendments to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and established the combined public policy of flexible price supports with acreage controls. The 1938 Act, as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1949, is the permanent authority for most commodity programs today. Beginning in 1973, the Congress adopted a series of 4-year omnibus farm bills amending the permanent authority and defining policy for the succeeding years. The 4-year omnibus farm bills have been broad in scope, encompassing commodity price supports, agricultural research, extension, domestic feeding programs, foreign food assistance, export promotion, and conservation.

The Agricultural Act of 1949 also established, for the first time, authority to donate surplus commodities to needy persons abroad through voluntary relief organizations. These so-called section 416 donations were incorporated as an important element of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, better known as Public Law 480 and later titled Food for Peace.

The decades of the 1960s and 1970s saw a gradual reduction of price support levels and less Federal control over farmers' produc-

tion decisions. Foreign markets strengthened and became sizable outlets, even larger than the domestic market, for some commodities. But the opportunities for growth and higher farm income accompanying exports are subject to substantial instability. While the 1970s were a period of rapid growth for the farm sector generally, led by expanding export markets, the early 1980s have been a period of readjustments as recession in world markets, coupled with increases in domestic and worldwide production, have led, once again, to stress in the farm economy. Much of the work of the Senate Agriculture Committee in the 1980s will continue to be designing policies and programs that will bring stability to the agricultural sector in general, and to producers, in particular.

COMMODITIES: LEGISLATION AND PROGRAMS

For the most part, early agricultural legislation was limited to two goals; increasing the efficiency of agricultural production and marketing, and providing the rural population with educational opportunities and services not available under normal conditions. More recently, in the past 60 years, Congress has embraced a much wider field with the focus of national attention shifting to farm income support and price stabilization. Current price support programs are the direct outgrowth of earlier experiences that were first initiated in the 1920s.

When farm prices fell sharply following World War I and failed to recover their pre-war relationship with the price of nonfarm products, Congress authorized special intermediate term agricultural credits for farmers and ranchers. This credit legislation was followed within a few years by the Capper-Volstead Act giving agricultural cooperatives special status within the framework of anti-trust legislation.

In spite of additional credit and the best efforts of farmer cooperatives, agriculture contined to lag behind the prosperity of the nonfarm economic sectors in the mid-1920s. Farm leaders therefore proposed legislation designed "to make the tariff effective" for such major agricultural export crops as wheat, cotton, and tobacco. These proposals became the McNary-Haugen bills authorizing exports at lower than domestic prices. The bills passed both Houses of Congress in 1927 and again in 1928 but were vetoed each time by President Coolidge.

The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929, which created the Federal Farm Board with a stabilization fund of $500 million, was a direct outgrowth of the unsuccessful attempts to get the McNary-Haugen proposals enacted into law. The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929 was endorsed by President Hoover as a substitute for the proposal to increase the domestic price level for the major export crops relative to the world level. The Federal Farm Board had two major fields of activity: strenthening farmer cooperatives and engaging in direct price stabilization operations with the $500 million revolving fund made available to it.

The Depression began about the same time that the Federal Farm Board started its operations. Economic conditions deteriorated rapidly, and the Farm Board soon found all its stabilization funds committed, yet farm prices and income continued to fall.

When the Roosevelt Administration came into office in 1933, it promptly sponsored passage of an Agricultural Adjustment Act. This

Act authorized production adjustment programs that were a direct out-growth of the experience of the Federal Farm Board. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 also authorized the use of marketing agreements and licenses, which had been used successfully by producers to promote orderly marketing of perishable fruits and vegetables.

The use of nonrecourse government loans (which could be satisfied by delivery of the product) to support the price of storable crops such as cotton, corn, and wheat began in a very modest way in the first year's activities of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. To assure farmers of immediate market prices in line with expected longer run price levels, the Secretary of Agriculture, in the fall of 1933, made available nonrecourse loans on cotton and corn at levels in excess of current market prices.

Throughout the 1930s, commodity programs unsuccessfully attempted to annually adjust supplies of the major crops in line with available market outlets at satisfactory prices. Marketing agreements and orders, which promoted more organized marketing and gave producers increased bargaining power, also were utilized by the producers of milk for fluid use in a number of city "milk sheds". Since the United States imported much of its sugar, special legislation was passed in 1934 allocating the domestic market between local producers, Cuban and other offshore producers, and providing for supplementary payments to domestic producers from a special tax on all sugar.

In 1936 the Supreme Court of the United States declared major portions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 unconstitutional. Congress and the Administration moved quickly and replaced it with the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936, which authorized Federal payments for voluntary conversion of land to conserving crops, but this legislation failed to bring production into balance with demand.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 ultimately became the legislative cornerstone for commodity price support programs. It authorized mandatory supply controls through acreage allotments and marketing quotas. In an amended form, this Act still serves as the foundation for commodity program policy, but, supply control is now achieved largely through voluntary mechanisms.

During the 1930s, the general philosophy of farm policy was that of assisting producers to adjust their production and marketing to improve and stabilize farm income and prices in a period of continued unemployment. The overall objective was the attainment of prices by farmers equal to a certain percentage of "parity" in purchasing power with nonfarm groups—i.e., a purchasing power equivalent to that enjoyed by farm producers in the period 1910–14.

The advent of World War II caused a change in attitudes toward farm policy and its objectives. During the war years the emphasis was on maximum production of farm commodities to assure ample supplies of food for the United States and its allies. The Federal Govern-

ment was exhorting farmers to produce more. In this atmosphere, farm leaders and others felt that potential adverse post-war effects of expanded production would require some compensatory action.

The so-called Steagall Amendment, approved October 2, 1942, required Government support of certain commodity prices for 2 years following the close of the war. The legislative history of the Steagall Amendment shows that Congress enacted it to bolster farm income and protect farmers against an anticipated sharp decline in demand following the war. It was restricted to commodities for which expanded production had been requested.

The price supports adopted under the Steagall Amendment was set to expire at the close of 1948. Congress, anticipating their expiration, in the Agriculture Act of 1948 extended price supports to 1950 on a substantial list of farm products at 90 percent of parity and provided for a range of price supports from 60 to 90 percent of parity after 1950. The 1948 Act also provided for the invocation of marketing quotas on the basic crops (cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts) when supplies became excessive.

The Agricultural Act of 1949 consolidated the price support provisions of several earlier laws. In addition to making changes in the price support and marketing quota provisions with respect to the basic commodities, the 1949 Act established mandatory supports for dairy products, tung nuts, honey, potatoes, and wool at levels ranging from 60 to 90 percent of parity.

During the early post-war years, a shift in policy emphasis away from expansion of agricultural production occurred. From 1948, major legislative interest centered on the mandatory price-support levels. Acreage allotments and marketing quotas, as provided for in 1938 legislation, were believed to be adequate to keep production in line with available market outlets at the support level prices.

The crop surpluses that accumulated in the early 1950s were thought to be temporary and that they could be eliminated through concessional sales and donations to developing nations. The Agricultural Trade Developmental and Assistance Act of 1954 (P.L. 480) was adopted as a short term solution to the surplus supply problem.

Bountiful harvests and declining livestock prices in the fall of 1955, however, caused farmers to propose additional emergency action aimed at bringing supplies into balance with demand at reasonably stable prices. The emergency action agreed upon in 1956 took the form of a two-part soil bank program. One part of this program was an acreage reserve program in effect for 3 years. The specific objective of the acreage reserve was to reduce the amount of land planted to the basic price-supported crops. Under its terms, farmers reduced land planted in these crops below established allotments and received payments for the diversion of such acreage to "conserving uses." The second part of the soil bank program was the conservation reserve, which offered modest rental payments for retiring other cropland acreages or entire farms from production for multiple-year periods.

Early in 1961 the Kennedy Administration requested emergency feed grain legislation. Approved March 22, 1961, the new Act provided for a voluntary feed grain adjustment program that was successful in reducing feed grain stocks in 1961 and 1962. A voluntary adjustment program also was added to the mandatory marketing quota program for wheat, which, together with favorable export developments, resulted in a substantial reduction of wheat stocks.

During the early 1960s, the Kennedy Administration proposed the adoption of several mandatory production adjustment and marketing order programs, all of which were rejected either by the Congress or by the producers of the commodity.

Finding such resistance to mandatory controls, the Congress, with Administration support, continued the voluntary adjustment program for feed grains and enacted new price-support legislation for cotton and wheat for 1964 and 1965. The 1964 legislation for cotton lowered the level of price support for most producers. The voluntary wheat legislation of 1964 authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to issue wheat marketing certificates that were to be purchased by the millers and exporters at prices announced by the Secretary of Agriculture. Wheat producers who voluntarily cooperated in the adjustment program received marketing certificates for about 40 percent of normal production on their allotted acres. Income from the sale of the certificates supplemented farm income from the market sales of wheat. The Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 extended most price-support and adjustment programs for a 4-year period with relatively few changes, except for cotton. Tobacco, peanuts, and rice remained under strict acreage controls. This Act was extended an additional year in 1968.

The significance of the several measures enacted in the early- to mid-1960s was that for the first time they separated income support from price support. Government price support loans were set at or near world price levels, rather than higher levels as in earlier years, in an attempt to keep U.S. prices competitive. In addition, direct payments for acreage diversion provided income support to farmers.

The Agricultural Act of 1970 took a substantial departure from the supply control technique of acreage allotments. Cropland set-aside rules replaced allotments of the grains and cotton. Loan rates were set low enough to be near the world market price so as not to preclude commerical export sales, as they had during the 1960s. Domestic wheat marketing certificates were continued, but in a modified version that preceded the deficiency payment provisions enacted in 1973. This legislation also placed, for the first time, a statutory limit on the annual amount of farm program payments that could be made to any one individual, $55,000 per person per crop.

The Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 set the pattern for later farm bills; it was a truly omnibus farm bill (incorporating commodity price support provisions, P.L. 480 extension, export reporting requirements, soil conservation, and food stamp program expansion), and it has a 4-year life. The omnibus nature of the legis-

lation created a political coalition of support from farm as well as urban interests. The 4-year life span put the next farm bill on the congressional agenda the year after the presidential election, thereby preventing it from becoming entangled in election year politics.

The 1973 Act made several important changes to current farm programs. First, the limit on farm program payments, established in 1970, was continued at the lower level of $20,000 per person. Second, the concept of target prices and deficiency payments was introduced. (Target prices are price levels guaranteed by the Federal Government, and deficiency payments are made to qualifying farmers whenever market prices fall below target prices.) With deficiency payments, loan rates could be kept below world market prices but farmer incomes would be supported at levels sufficient to cover their production costs. This legislation provided a substantial shift toward market oriented farm policy that coincided with an upsurge in export demand. Third, direct payments for production shortfalls of wheat, feed grains, and cotton programs were added; this came to be called the disaster payments program.

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 continued the market oriented loan and target price policies of the 1973 legislation, as well as payment limitations, but at levels gradually increasing to $50,000 per person. Exports had become an increasingly important market and source of income to America's farmers, plus an important positive element in the Nation's trade balance. However, export markets can be unstable, and unexpectedly slow growth in foreign demand compared to more rapidly growing production resulted in low prices and created pressure for higher support levels in the 1977 legislation. The instability problem of a market oriented agriculture was addressed by the establishment of an extended storage program for grains, known as the farmer-owned reserve. The farmer-owned reserve provided economic incentives for farmers to isolate their grain from the market when prices are depressed and release their grain to commercial buyers when short supplies create sufficiently high market prices.

Even though the commodity programs authorized in 1977 were not due to expire until the fall of 1981, several important pieces of commodity legislation were enacted in the intervening period.

Low farm prices led to legislative increases in commodity program benefits. In addition, a different type of legislative milestone was the expansion of the crop insurance program. The Federal Crop Insurance Act of 1980 authorized a new federally-subsidized all-risk insurance program that was designed to make coverage available in all parts of the country on all crops. This subsidized insurance program was intended to replace other forms of disaster assistance.

The Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 continued, for the most part, the basic structure of the commodity programs for another 4 years, but with gradually increasing target price levels for the major commodities.

However, and largely unrecognized in 1981, a variety of conditions were causing this Nation's export position to change. Countries that had become large buyers of U.S. farm products during the 1970s made substantial reductions in their purchases and increasingly turned to other nations to supply their needs. This turn of events was due to several interrelated developments: many developing nations that were large importers and had gone deeply into debt found themselves unable to meet repayment obligations and, without new sources of credit, were forced to reduce their purchases; a series of export control actions culminating in the 1980 grain embargo to the Soviet Union which lessened this Nation's reputation as a reliable supplier of food and caused some importing countries, especially the Soviet Union, to diversify its market sources; the dollar made substantial gains against other currencies and this made American commodities expensive compared to those of other exporters; this Nation's commodity loan and reserve program served to isolate its surpluses from world markets and forced production cutbacks as the only way to moderate the Government's cost of these programs. Other nations responded to the price umbrella and supply controls imposed by the United States by increasing production and in some cases subsidizing the export of surpluses.

In view of these factors and the need to reduce Federal spending to reduce the budget deficits, a number of measures were enacted in 1982, 1983, and 1984 to moderate or eliminate scheduled increases in loan and target price levels. This occurred with respect to dairy products, wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, rice, and tobacco. In the case of dairy and tobacco, farmers for the first time were required to pay assessments to the Government to offset at least a part of the cost of the price support programs.

By 1985, when it was time for another omnibus farm bill, the farm sector was suffering a serious economic recession. Commodity prices and farm incomes were down, and carryover inventories (almost all under Government loan) were reaching record levels. Farmers and agricultural lenders were in the midst of a debt crisis brought about by a precipitous decline in land values. At the heart of the problem was a dramatic drop in America's agricultural exports. The lag in exports was caused by a number of international as well as domestic factors. Among the causes, high nonrecourse loan levels were making U.S. commodities uncompetitive, and were also encouraging other nations to increase production.

The omnibus Food Security Act of 1985 (which provided price support authority through 1990) permitted sharp reductions in most 1986 commodity loan rates to make the United States once again price competitive in world markets. The new provisions were designed to eventually reduce loan rates to 85 percent of average market prices. Farmers were to be protected from the anticipated drop in revenue through expectedly large deficiency payments. Target prices were to initially remain at their 1985 levels and then be gradually reduced.

The new commodity price support authority included several departures from tradition. The legislation encouraged the Secretary of Agriculture to make required payments to farmers in certificates redeemable in Government-owned surplus commodities rather than cash. This use of so-called "generic certificates" was intended to move surplus commodity stocks into the market at competitive prices. Provisions for the repayment of rice and cotton nonrecourse loans were modified to discourage any forfeiture of commodities to the Government. These new "marketing loan" provisions allowed farmers to fully satisfy repayment of the loan principal at the going lower market price. To help balance the Nation's milk supply with demand, dairy farmers were offered the opportunity to receive compensation from the Federal Government in return for selling their entire herd and commiting not to return to dairy farming for at least 5 years. This was known as the whole-herd buyout program.

In the early 1970s many analysts grimly forecast that the world's need for food would outstrip its productive capacity. This view was widely accepted through the decade and was one basis for the policies that encouraged rapid expansion of production and exports. Many analysts now believe that the world's capacity to produce food, augmented by technological advances, will be more than adequate for the foreseeable future. The problems of hunger are recognized as related to income distribution and local political or production problems rather than a shortage of global supplies.

The problems that America's farmers now face create a serious dilemma for the makers of farm policy. Producers in the United States have become highly dependent on foreign markets as a source of revenue and agriculture plays an important role in our balance of payments. A substantial production and marketing infrastructure has been built to supply foreign markets. Yet world prices are too low for many farmers to remain in business without Government assistance.

United States agriculture can remain competitive in a world of stable and even declining real commodity prices. This is possible because America's agriculture has the ability and willingness to improve its productivity at a more rapid rate than the rest of the world.

The challenge for agricultural policymakers, including the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, is to design Federal farm programs and institutions that will facilitate economic progress for the farm sector in the future. There will be adjustment costs, but the Government can provide stability and equity through a well designed farm policy.

FARM CREDIT: LEGISLATION AND PROGRAMS

Agricultural producers' demand for credit to finance land and farm machinery purchases increased in the late 19th and early 20th centuries as America's agriculture became more commercialized to meet growing domestic and foreign food demand. Private lenders at the turn of the century proved increasingly inadequate to meet these needs for financing. Slowly, a consensus emerged in Congress that the Federal Government should develop facilities for providing farm mortgage credit to assist farmers and ranchers in purchasing land on affordable terms. This and related concerns about the availability of credit on reasonable terms led to legislation creating the first banks of the Cooperative Farm Credit System or Farm Credit System, in 1916. Later, Congress established the Farmers Home Administration in response to the devasting economic impact of the Great Depression of the 1930s. Today, both extend credit to agricultural producers under the authorities provided in Federal law.

Both the Farm Credit System (FCS) and the Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) have played major roles in supplementing agricultural credit provided by private lenders such as commercial banks and life insurance companies by providing credit to enable producers to purchase farmland as well as to finance annual production expenses. The two lenders play different roles. The FCS provides credit to creditworthy borrowers. FmHA makes financial assistance available primarily to family farmers unable to secure credit at reasonable rates and terms from private lenders.

Congress established the banks and associations of the current FCS between 1916 and 1933 to make loans to farmers and ranchers and their cooperatives. All FCS institutions are private credit cooperatives owned by their borrower-members, and operate at no cost to the Federal Government. Loan funds are raised by selling notes and bonds in the financial markets. The cost of raising funds is a key determinant of the interest rate charged agricultural producers and their cooperatives when loans are made. FCS institutions are supervised, regulated, and examined by the Farm Credit Administration.

Congress established the Farm Credit System in three stages to respond to specific difficulties which producers faced in obtaining credit. The Federal Farm Loan Act of 1916 provided for the establishment of one Federal land bank in each of 12 districts in the United States to make long-term farm mortgage loans through local associations in which the borrowers became members and stockholders. These banks were created to meet the lack of adequate credit to

finance real estate purchases by making mortgages available on affordable terms.

The Agricultural Credit Act of 1923 added a Federal intermediate credit bank in each district to provide funds to commercial banks and other agricultural lenders for loans to finance production costs. These banks were created as a result of the inability of commercial banks to meet farmers' production credit needs during the agricultural depression of the 1920's.

The Farm Credit Act of 1933 established the third component of the system—local production credit associations to make short- and intermediate-term production loans to farmers. Congress created these associations to channel funds directly to producers from each intermediate credit bank because private lenders were unable to meet the credit needs of those coping with the impact of the Great Depression. Responding to the financing difficulties which farmer cooperatives had faced in the 1920s, the 1933 Act also provided for 12 district banks for cooperatives and a Central Bank to make loans to farmers' marketing, purchasing, and business service cooperatives.

The Farm Credit Administration (FCA), which supervises the Farm Credit System, was established as an independent agency in 1933 by an Executive Order. Under a reorganization plan, the FCA was transferred to the Department of Agriculture in 1939. The Farm Credit Act of 1953 reconstituted the FCA under the direction, supervision, and control of the Federal Farm Credit Board and established it as an independent Federal agency. When Congress established each component of the FCS, the Federal Government provided capital to establish a financial base to carry out each bank's operations. The 1953 Act, however, declared the policy of Congress to favor increased borrower participation in the control and ultimate ownership of the Farm Credit System and the eventual retirement of all Federal Government capital. By 1969, all government capital had been retired.

The Farm Credit Act of 1971 recodified all the Acts that had established the three bank groups and broadened the System's lending authorities. In addition, changes made were to modernize the System to meet changing and projected farm and rural credit needs.

More recently, the Farm Credit Act Amendments of 1980 further expanded the lending authority of Systems' institutions and permitted them to improve their services to borrowers.

The second major source of Government-sponsored agricultural credit, the Farmers Home Administration (FmHA), had its beginnings in the Resettlement Administration, a rural rehabilitation agency established by Executive Order in 1935. This agency was created to advance short-term loans to low-income tenant farmers who did not qualify for credit from other lenders.

In July 1937, Congress passed the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to expand the Resettlement Administration's farm lending programs. This Act authorized the Resettlement Administration, shortly thereafter renamed the Farm Security Administration, to implement a

new program that made available supervised farm ownership loans with 40-year terms to farmers who lacked other credit sources to purchase their own land and to improve their farms and homes. This program was successful in strengthening many family farmers who helped meet the awesome food-producing challenges during World War II.

In 1946, Congress reorganized the Farm Security Administration under the Farmers Home Administration Act. This action reflected the consensus that a restructuring of the Farm Security Administration was necessary to meet the credit needs of the post-war period. This Act authorized the new FmHA to insure loans and to make direct loans using Government funds. This new agency included some programs of the Farm Security Administration, as well as the emergency crop and feed loan program that had been implemented through the production credit associations of the Farm Credit System since 1933. The Disaster Loan Act of 1949 expanded these responsibilities by initiating the special emergency farm loan program to assist farmers in recovering from natural disasters.

Congress updated laws dealing with FmHA programs in the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961. Its main provision raised the ceilings on farm ownership and farm operating loans; these limits have subsequently been raised a number of times. Subsequent amendments to this Act further expanded these programs in diverse ways, such as by authorizing loans to family farmers to establish farm-based recreational and other nonagricultural enterprises to supplement family income, and by making loans available to associations, whose membership includes family farmers and ranchers.

The Rural Development Act of 1972 affected farm credit progrms in a number of ways. Among its most important provisions, this Act broadened the role of FmHA by authorizing it to guarantee farm loans made by commercial lenders and by raising the lending limit on a farm operating loan. These provisions reflected growing Congressional concern about providing adequate financial assistance not only to farmers but to the greater rural community as well.

The Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 added a new major emergency credit program to deal with the problem of farmers being squeezed by increasing costs and declining income. The economic emergency program authorized FmHA to make or guarantee loans up to $400,000 to agricultural producers to provide temporary credit assistance to those who otherwise would not be able to maintain a viable agricultural enterprise. Reflecting concern about the cost of other FmHA programs, Congress, in the 1978 Act, also changed the interest rate for farm ownership loans to reflect the Government's cost of borrowing.

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 amended the emergency disaster loan program to increase the interest rate charged on loans made to cover actual losses. Further reflecting concerns about bringing growing Federal expenditures under control, this provision increased the size of loss a producer would have to ex-

perience by reducing the portion of actual loss that would be covered by an emergency loan.

A severe drought in 1983 prompted congressional consideration and enactment of the Emergency Agriculture Credit Act of 1984 which expanded the disaster loan program. This Act also increased the limits on direct and guaranteed farm operating loans. Severe drought and flooding in 1986 led to enactment of additional disaster assistance programs, including debt relief provisions and the transfer of $400 million from FmHA's emergency loan program to fund an expanded disaster payments program.

In the 1980s, Congress has been faced with growing farmer debt problems, driven by declining farm land values and persistently low commodity prices. These problems have caused stress to many of the Nation's farmers and the FCS. Under provisions in the Food Security Act of 1985, FmHA began a 3-year shift from reliance on direct loans to reliance on loan guarantees. This law also instituted a 3-year, $490 million interest rate buy-down program in conjunction with the change to loan guarantees to alleviate the financial pressures on many debt-stricken farmers. Additionally, legislation to help reduce the severe financial pressures on the FCS was enacted in 1985 and 1986. These laws were designed to help the entire system share the losses of its weaker institutions, to deal with the worst problem loans, and also to loosen accounting requirements for System banks.

Both the Farm Credit System and the Farmers Home Administration have been successful in meeting the farm sector's changing financial needs. Timely action to provide dependable credit from these Government-created institutions has enabled countless farm families to survive difficult economic circumstances when private credit was unavailable on reasonable terms. Congress will continue to be faced with credit issues, including meeting the growing capital needs of producers, facilitating the entry of new farmers in light of the high costs associated with starting an operation, and creating flexible lending arrangements that work in a changing financial environment.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND AID: LEGISLATION AND PROGRAMS

Throughout much of our history, the U.S. agricultural sector has been dependent on foreign markets, and the U.S. market has absorbed large quantities of agricultural imports. Therefore, both American farmers and consumers have been significantly affected by agricultural trade policy decisions. Moreover, given the amount of domestic economic activity generated by farm exports, nonfarm workers have been equally affected by farm trade.

Agricultural trade has been an important aspect of the American economy ever since the earliest colonial years. In fact, one of the reasons for the founding of the "new land" was that of obtaining a source for raw materials and agricultural products, while developing a new market for manufactured products from Europe. Trade was intrinsic to the growth of the colonies and, as early as the 1770s, the colonists were concerned with the question of free versus protectionist trade policies. This controversy over the merits of free trade versus protectionism continues today.

This perennial issue has been debated by Congress throughout American history, and depending on the domestic and international atmosphere, Congress has enacted legislation adjusting trade policies to reflect the political and economic realities of the time. It has debated and assessed domestic and international policy relationships, continually striving for agricultural, as well as general, trade policies that would benefit U.S. producers, consumers, and the Nation as a whole. Trade policies have ranged from highly protectionist during the 1930s, reflected in the enactment of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff of 1930, to the post-WW II policy of gradual elimination of all tariff and nontariff barriers to trade, evidenced by this Nation's leading role in the 1947 establishment and continuing refinement of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

To meet the critical situation facing U.S. producers during the Great Depression, Congress enacted several new programs—both domestic and international in nature—designed to provide income support and supply stabilization for the farm sector. To alleviate the unfavorable effects of trade on domestic policy and to encourage trade, Congress passed two significant pieces of legislation affecting agricultural trade. Section 22, the first nontariff legislation for the general regulation of agricultural imports, was added to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 by amendment on August 24, 1935. It has been revised several times, but continues to ensure that imports not inter-

fere with Department of Agriculture domestic farm programs by authorizing the President to impose import fees or quotas, if deemed necessary.

At the same time, section 32 of P.L. 320, the Act of August 24, 1935, provided authority for subsidy payments to be made to assist exports of specified U.S. surplus commodities such as wheat and cotton. Section 32 authorizes three programs: (1) to encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities and products thereof; (2) to encourage domestic consumption of commodities or products by diverting them from the normal channels of trade and commerce, or by increasing their use among persons in low income groups; and (3) to reestablish farmers' purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any commodity for domestic consumption.

To better provide post-World War II adjustment policies for the U.S. farm sector, Congress made permanent the Commodity Credit Corporation through enactment of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act on June 28, 1948. (Between 1933 and 1948, the Commodity Credit Corporation charter was regularly renewed, but only for short periods of time). During the war U.S. farms had been operating at maximum capacity to support the military and to feed residents of allied nations whose productive capabilities had been destroyed. Anticipating a possible farm crisis as demand shifted to prewar levels, the CCC Charter Act provided post-war adjustment policies and programs including provision for export promotion programs as one way of supporting farm income and stabilizing commodity supplies at a time of uncertainty. Authority for the export promotion programs provided in the Charter Act form the foundation for today's Federal export efforts. These programs authorized through the Act include programs to finance export credit sales of agricultural commodities, to conduct special export programs for bartered materials, to implement export sales of CCC-owned commodities, to conduct export payment programs, and to generally arrange transportation for commodities from point of export. Over the years, these programs have resulted in billions of dollars worth of agricultural commodity exports as well as positive long-term effects on overseas market development for U.S. products.

As expected, the post-war era saw a decline in demand and farm income with a corresponding increase in surplus commodities. Congress responded to this situation by passing the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (P.L. 480) which sought to simultaneously provide food and fiber to the world's needy while reducing U.S. farm surpluses. The law authorized the Government to make agreements for the sale of farm products for foreign currency, to make shipments for emergency relief and other aid, and to barter farm products owned by the CCC for materials required by our Government.

P.L. 480, commonly known as the Food for Peace Program, has been the principal authority for American food aid for 3 decades.

Not only has the program been of major importance in developing new markets for, and in disposing of, farm products abroad, it has also aided the economies of developing countries and fed the hungry throughout the world. On the 30th anniversary of the program, President Reagan lauded the program as "one of the greatest humanitarian acts ever performed by one nation for the needy of other nations."

Numerous accomplishments can be attributed to the Food for Peace Program. The value of P.L. 480 food aid has grown from $69.51 million in 1954 to an estimated $1.7 billion in 1986. Since the program's inception, an estimated 675 billion pounds of food products, worth about $43 billion, have been delivered to hungry people throughout the world. About 1.8 billion people in more than 100 countries have received direct benefits from this program. And, perhaps most importantly, the Food for Peace Program continues to strongly encourage self-help and developmental reform in recipient countries.

Over the years, Congress had repeatedly reassessed U.S. food aid and agricultural trade policies, making adjustments whenever necessary to ensure the economic well-being of the farm sector and U.S. consumer, as well as to better meet world food needs.

During most of the 1970s, the U.S. benefitted from rapidly expanding world markets for agricultural exports. As a result of this growth in demand, U.S. farm prices and incomes strengthened and agricultural surpluses declined. To ensure that the United States remained competitive in expanding foreign markets, Congress enacted the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 which created four major initiatives to foster and expand U.S. agricultural exports. The legislation authorized intermediate export credit programs, the establishment of U.S. trade offices around the world, the Secretaries of State and Agriculture to jointly raise the level of agricultural representation abroad from attache to counselor as well as provided eligibility for short-term agricultural export credit to the Peoples' Republic of China.

Just as a number of factors had combined during the 1970s to dramatically boost foreign demand for U.S. farm products, several events during the 1980s dampened foreign demand for U.S. agricultural commodities. The 1980 embargo of grains to a major market, the Soviet Union, in conjunction with various trade suspensions during the 1970s, prompted intense congressional debate over the implications of using food exports to advance U.S. foreign policy objectives.

U.S. agricultural exports have also suffered from restricted foreign markets due to unfavorable economic conditions—especially the growing debt problems of several developing countries—the protectionist policies of some importing nations including growing protectionist trends at home, as well as certain domestic farm policies that have tended to further restrict export expansion.

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry has actively worked to address these factors. To protect the farm sector from potential adverse impacts of agricultural embargoes, Congress included embargo protection provisions in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977, the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981, and the Food Security Act of 1985. To restore confidence in America's reliability as a supplier following the 1980 grain embargo, a provision providing for the sanctity of agricultural export contracts was included in legislation reauthorizing the Commodity Futures Trading Commission in 1982.

Seeking to combat other factors threatening farm exports, Congress, in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1982, required the use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds to counter subsidies and other unfair trade practices being used by other nations.

Congress moved to further promote exports in provisions in the 1985 Food Security Act, as amended. These laws provide substantial credit guarantees, and mandate a minimum value of sales. One of these programs is a 3-year, $1 billion export payment-in-kind program, while another provides a minimum of $5 billion annually in short-term credit guarantees. Moreover, changes in domestic commodity programs under the 1985 law are expected to significantly improve this Nation's competitive position in world agricultural markets. The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry recognizes that the farm economy is necessarily dependent upon export markets, and that expanded agricultural trade is vital to American farmers, consumers, and the economy as a whole. In light of this, the Committee will continue to work to coordinate domestic and export farm policies to address the perennial issue of free trade versus protectionism, and to explore alternative programs and policies aimed at maintaining and expanding agricultural export markets.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION: LEGISLATION AND PROGRAMS

Conservation has been an important objective of agricultural legislation since the 1930s. Congress first recognized the need for conservation in terms of erosion control. A slowly expanding array of soil conservation needs has been subsequently identified and addressed in legislative enactments. More recently, water supply and water quality have received growing attention. The collection of conservation laws has created programs which provide incentives, and assistance to producers to plan, install and maintain practices to conserve soil, to conserve the supply and protect the quality of water, and to reduce floods. The Department of Agriculture now recognizes 28 programs in 8 agencies that have as a goal providing conservation benefits. Each of these agencies delivers its program benefits to individual producers in different ways. The large variety of programs and delivery systems are no accident. Congress has long recognized that agricultural producers will participate in a voluntary program only if benefits and incentives are flexible, and the present system reflects this flexibility, offering a broad range of options designed to attract producers.

The first general authority to conserve soil resources dates back to the early 1930s when dust from wind erosion in the Great Plains darkened the skies across America all the way to our eastern shores. In the spring of 1935, the 74th Congress enacted the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act which established soil and water conservation as a national policy and created the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) to develop and implement a long range conservation program.

SCS has developed into the Department of Agriculture's technical arm of action for soil and water conservation. It cooperates closely with Federal, State and local agencies that deal in matters related to maintaining the quality of land and water resources. A principal activity of SCS is providing assistance in developing and implementing conservation plans for individual farms. These plans meld specific resource problems such as soil erosion, with practices that have proven to be effective in providing conservation benefits. After more than 40 years of effort, plans had been completed by September 1982 covering more than 630 million acres of the Nation's 1,400 million acres of farmland. The SCS assigns professionals to all of these districts to provide them with technical assistance.

Under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936, Congress first authorized the Agricultural Stabilization and Conserva-

tion Service (ASCS) to provide cost-sharing for soil and water conservation through the Agricultural Conservation Program (ACP). Under this program, the Federal Government shares costs with farmers and ranchers to assist them in carrying out soil-building and soil and water-conserving practices. ASCS, like SCS, has employees in virtually every rural county to deliver cost-sharing assistance to individual producers. Each county also has advisory boards, like the soil conservation districts, that help determine which practices should receive priority funding through the ACP program. Congress amended the goals and authorities of this program in title X of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973, and made less significant adjustments to the program through other enactments during the past decade.

Cost-sharing is limited to on-farm conservation measures considered necessary to meet the most urgent local problems, and which would not otherwise be carried out to the extent needed to protect the public interest. A maximum amount of $3,500 is available to each producer each year under this program.

Another important program with conservation goals was also authorized in the 1930s. Congress first recognized the importance of providing upstream watershed protection and flood prevention as a complement to the downstream flood control program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the Omnibus Flood Control Act of June 1936. In this Act, Congress authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out surveys and investigations of watersheds and to install measures for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil erosion prevention.

Experience gained in early watershed demonstration projects led to a new concept in watershed protection. In 1954, Congress enacted the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act which authorized the Department of Agriculture through SCS, to provide technical and financial assistance to local watershed groups willing to assume responsibility for initiating, carrying out, and sharing the costs of upstream watershed conservation and flood prevention. This legislation has been amended in 10 different years since 1954. In these amendments, Congress expanded the authorized purposes of Federal assistance for watershed projects to include municipal water-supply development, irrigation and other phases of agricultural water management, fish and wildlife development, and recreation purposes. Congress also raised limits on project expenditures that could be made without congressional approval.

The program's fundamental principles are (1) local initiatives and responsibility, (2) Federal technical and financial aid, and (3) State review and approval of local proposals with the opportunity for State financial and other assistance.

In the 10 Great Plains States, an area of severe climatic hazards and the source of dust wind erosion that triggered the national policy for soil and water conservation in the 1930s, various programs have been implemented to meet erosion-related situations. In 1956, the

84th Congress passed legislation authorizing a Great Plains Conservation Program in an amendment to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. The goal of this program, administered by SCS, is to bring about a more permanent solution to problems that accompany drought and the cultivation of low-grade cropland of assisting farmers to make changes in their cropping systems or land use. Farmers participating in this program sign long-term soil and water conservation agreements to install and maintain needed land use adjustments and the application of enduring conservation practices. Congress has amended the program numerous times, extended its coverage and increased its appropriations. Most recently, for example, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act doubled the cost limit of the program and increased the annual limit on cost-sharing funds. It also made additional causes of erosion eligible for treatment under the program.

The 87th Congress, through the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, provided a new authority for speeding up resource programs in broad multi-county areas as a basis for economic development. This authority has been used for Resource Conservation and Development (RC&D) projects, a program administered by the Soil Conservation Service. The Resource Conservation and Development Projects-Federal Assistance Act expanded the program in 1970 by authorizing the Secretary to share costs on certain fish, wildlife and recreation developments.

RC&D project areas generally are larger than a single county, and typically encompass ¼ to 3 million acres. Each project must be large enough to include the resources and related developments that affect its area, but small enough for effective local leadership and speedy development of a project plan.

Local sponsors of RC&D projects have included conservation districts, county governing bodies, town, local and State agencies, irrigation districts, public development corporations, and others. These projects are designed to create a base for new jobs and higher incomes, as well as provide for outdoor recreation and countryside beautification.

In the 1970s, Congress enacted the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977, commonly referred to as the RCA. It requires the Soil Conservation Service to conduct a continuing appraisal of soil, water, and related resources, and to use that appraisal as the basis for developing a national comprehensive soil and water conservation program. This Act, as amended, defines when appraisals and programs are to be submitted to Congress. The first program, due in 1980, was submitted to Congress in December 1982. The program documents submitted in 1982 have served as a basis for debating alternative approaches to conservation, and relationships between different appropriation levels and the ability of the Department to reach conservation goals. The next program will be submitted to Congress in 1987.

Also during the 1970s, Congress expanded the concept of conservation and consideration of alternative roles for the Department and its agencies in ways that probably were not anticipated earlier. Recent enactments outside the primary jurisdiction of the Agriculture Committee have assigned important new resource conservation responsibilities to the Department of Agriculture to become involved in surface mine reclamation, improving water quality from nonpoint sources, and salinity control.

Analysis of resource data to develop and implement the initial REA program has stimulated some startling changes in the national debate on conservation. These analyses have shown that despite intensive efforts to control erosion, it is still occurring at unacceptable levels on large portions of the country's cropland. The Senate Agriculture Committee took the lead in using this information to redefine the conservation agenda by creating new and innovative approaches to solving this ongoing problem. The Committee played a key role in enacting the Conservation Reserve Program, conservation compliance, and swampbuster in the Food Security Act of 1985. The Conservation Reserve pays farmers to retire highly erodible land from production for at least 10 years. This program, with a goal of retiring 45 million acres, is designed to provide the dual benefit of a reduction in soil erosion as well as a reduction in Federal commodity program payments limiting production of surplus crops. Conservation compliance and swampbuster make any producer who cultivates highly erodible land or converts wetlands to cropland respectively ineligible for most Federal farm program benefits thus making Federal policies more consistent. The Committee will be watching the effects of these new programs, which have been termed "the most significant conservation legislation in 50 years", to ensure that they provide conservation benefits, as well as effectively reduce surplus production.

FORESTRY: LEGISLATION AND PROGRAMS

Forests have played an important role in the development of America. Initially, forests were seen as impediments to the westward expansion of the Nation, but their value in providing building materials and protecting watersheds was recognized before 1900. Recognizing their importance, Congress enacted legislation—section 24 of the Act of March 3, 1891—providing for the establishment of the first Federal forest reserves. The jurisdiction over the 56 million acres of reserves was transferred from the U.S. Department of the Interior to the U.S. Department of Agriculture in 1905, and the Bureau of Forestry became the Forest Service. President Theodore Roosevelt added to the system in 1906 and 1907, more than doubling the area and changing the name of the reserves to National Forests. Today, the National Forest System contains nearly 191 million acres in 44 States and is a major focus of Forest Service activities and funding. The Forest Service also provides assistance to States and to private forest owners and conducts and coordinates forestry research.

Congress passed the Weeks Act in 1911, which gave new direction to the National Forest System. It allowed the Federal Government to purchase forest lands to protect the flow of water in navigable streams. Most of the 28 million acres of national forests east of the Great Plains have been acquired under this Act and other Acts amending it.

Congress has been active in providing guidance to the Forest Service in managing the national forests. The initial guidance, the Organic Act of 1897, identified watershed protection and future timber supplies as two reasons for the establishment of the forest reserves, and established conditions under which timber could be sold or given away.

The landmark Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960 declared that the national forests are to be administered for outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, wilderness, and wildlife and fish. In this Act, Congress determined that the Forest Service should serve the public good by judiciously balancing their uses. The Act calls for attaining the highest practical output from forest resources without impairing the productivity of the land. In enacting this legislation, Congress affirmed long-established Forest Service policy.

The Senate Agriculture Committee has been involved in wilderness legislation when it affects acquired national forest lands. The Committee played an integral part in the enactment of the Eastern Wilderness Act of 1975 which designated more than 200,000 acres of

wilderness areas on the eastern national forests. In the 98th Congress, the Committee reported, and Congress passed, bills to add more than 350,000 acres of wilderness in 10 States to the National Wilderness Preservation System and to create national recreation areas totaling almost 60,000 acres in two of those States.

The Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (RPA) established a comprehensive long-range planning process for the national forests. The Act directs the Secretary of Agriculture to assess the forest and rangeland resources of the United States every 10 years and requires a recommended Renewable Resources Program to be prepared and submitted to Congress every 5 years. The Program, in concert with other Federal, State and local efforts, is to address the resource problems identified in the Assessment. This Program, together with the President's Statement of Policy, provides the general direction for the management of the national forests and for budget requests of the Forest Service. In 1976 and again in 1980, Congress debated and revised the Administration's proposed program.

The National Forest Management Act of 1976 amended the RPA by requiring an integrated resource management plan for each unit of the National Forest System. In this Act, Congress gave explicit guidance on the processes to be followed and the considerations to be included in developing these plans. The plans for each national forest are to be coordinated, through regional plans, with the RPA Assessment and RPA Program.

Federal cooperation with States by providing forest fire protection on State and private lands in the watersheds of navigable rivers was also initiated by the Weeks Act of 1911. The Clark-McNary Act of 1924 broadened the cooperative efforts to include producing and distributing tree seedlings and providing forestry assistance to farmers. These laws also gave a strong impetus to States to establish and support State forestry agencies; all 50 States now have a State forestry agency or forestry extension agency.

The Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 consolidated and clarified the Forest Service programs for assisting private forest owners and State agencies. Technical and financial assistance for rural landowners was separated from assistance for urban forestry projects. The programs of coordinated control for insects and diseases and for forest fires were clarified. A new program was established to assist State resource agencies in developing long-range integrated resource management plans that could be coordinated with the RPA Assessment and RPA Program for the national forests.

To address the issue of forest research, Congress enacted the McSweeny-McNary Act in 1928 to authorize a broad program of forest research by the Forest Service. The goal of this program was "to insure adequate supplies of timber and other forest products." The Act also authorized a nationwide survey of the 648 million acres of forest land in all ownerships. The first survey, begun in 1930, was completed in 1947. New forest surveys have been conducted on

roughly a 10-year cycle throughout the country. Since the passage of RPA, forest surveys are being conducted as a major input of the RPA Assessment.

The Federal role in forestry research was expanded greatly in 1962 by the McIntyre-Stennis Act. Congress recognized the need to establish a program of forest research at the public land-grant colleges. The funding is administered through the agricultural experiment stations, but the Forest Service often provides guidance and coordination to prevent duplication of research efforts.

By enacting the RPA and NFMA, Congress established a planning process for the National Forest System which provides for adjusting management to changing conditions over time. Congress is likely to use RPA and NFMA documents for periodic oversight which is likely to be the primary congressional involvement in forestry issues in the near future, given the well established basic patterns for Federal forest management and for forestry research and assistance programs. Congressional revision of national forest management is most likely to occur through revisions of the President's Statement of Policy.

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION: LEGISLATION AND PROGRAMS

American agriculture has advanced more in the past 50 years than in any comparable period in the country's history. Modern farming, combined with a progressive system of marketing, provides an abundant supply of high quality food for U.S. and foreign consumers. Productivity per acre, per person, and per animal unit has more than doubled since the 1930s. Much of the credit for improvements in agricultural production techniques must be given to the extensive system of agricultural research and education programs created by the Congress over the past 130 years. In addition, the research carried on by State agricultural colleges and the Department of Agriculture has been supplemented by research and development work in the farm supply industries. Individual firms in many of the industries supplying farmers carry on research and development work to create new or improved products. These products contribute to improvements in farm productivity. The creative genius of American farmers and ranchers, combined with the incentives provided by the American free enterprise system, are also essential factors.

The Federal role in agricultural research and education has a long history. In 1862, the U.S. Department of Agriculture was established, in part, to ". . . acquire and preserve . . . all information concerning agriculture which he can obtain by means of correspondence and by practical and scientific experiments, . . ."

A Member of Congress, who felt his own lack of education, proposed that public land be made available to each State for the establishment and operation of State agricultural and mechanical colleages. In arguing for passage of this legislation, Congressman Morrill pointed out that existing colleges taught only subjects for the "learned professions", and there were no centers for advanced learning for young people interested in agriculture and engineering. The lack of Government encouragement to agriculture in the United States, he said, had prevented the improvement of farming methods. He also sensed a great public demand for field and laboratory experiments.

After several years of active consideration, this legislation was finally passed and signed into law by President Lincoln in 1862. At the time the Morrill Act was passed, agricultural colleges were in operation in four States. Within the next 10 years, agricultural colleges began operation in 26 more States. The Act provided that a State might receive 30,000 acres of public lands within its borders for each Senator and Representative it had in Congress for the support of col-

leges teaching agriculture and the mechanical arts. The great objective was a liberal and practical education of the people in the professions of life. Subsequently, Congress had provided direct annual grants to these colleges for more precisely specified educational purposes.

In 1867, Morrill was elected to the U.S. Senate where he continued his legislative campaign for additional support for land-grant colleges. An Act approved in 1890 assured each land-grant college an annual Federal grant of $25,000 and authorized support for separate land-grant colleges for blacks.

The development of laboratory work in which students participated was a major educational contribution of the new land-grant colleges. It soon became evident that the experimental work carried out by the agricultural professors needed more support and attention than could be given it by full-time teachers. The Hatch Experiment Station Act, enacted in 1887, established funding, in cooperation with States, for experimental work to be carried on in an organized manner in agricultural experiment stations affiliated with the organic agricultural colleges. The close working relationship between Federal and State agencies under this Act has served as a model for Federal-State cooperation in other areas.

While Agricultural Experiment Station research is organized primarily to solve agriculture's most pressing problems, there have also been many by-products that have paved the way for general advancement in the biological and life sciences. Some of these have helped medical research win victories over diseases like tuberculosis, brucellosis, rabies and others. Much of the great progress made in the field of antibiotics first grew out of experiment station research that had for its objective a better understanding of the nature of soil bacteria. In 1958, two former agricultural experiment station scientists were awarded the Nobel prize in medicine for work they did in station genetics research. Their findings opened a way to understanding the characteristics of some virus forms.

As agricultural research activities expanded it soon became evident that research results should be made available not only to students, but to members of the farming community at large. The creation of agricultural extension departments at the colleges was proposed to facilitate dissemination of new information directly to operating farmers.

In the early 1900s a major outbreak of the cotton boll weevil occurred, and cotton production was almost destroyed in the Southeastern United States. The agricultural experiment stations reported that known methods of control were adequate, if farmers would follow certain practices. On the basis of these reports, Congress provided special funds to finance demonstration work to teach boll weevil control methods to farmers. This demonstration work in the Southern States, under the leadership of Dr. Seaman Knapp, was an outstanding success.

Out of this background, popular and congressional support developed for a nationwide system of county agents financed cooperatively by local people, the individual States and the Federal Government. The demonstration method, which had been so successful in combating the cotton boll weevil, was written into the Smith-Lever Act of 1914. This Act established the nationwide agricultural extension service. The Act defined extension work to include giving instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics, and imparting information through field demonstrations, publications, and otherwise. Soon after the passage of this legislation, county agents were established in all important agricultural counties of the Nation.

The Cooperative Extension Service began operation as a national program in 1914, the year in which World War I began in Europe. America's entry into the war 3 years later brought many new duties to the county agent. A major objective of the new Cooperative Extension Service became to assist in the rapid expansion of food production to meet the needs of the United States and its allies in Europe. The successful contribution extension made to the war efforts greatly increased the prestige of the service, both in rural communities and in government.

The Bankhead-Flannagan Act of 1945 further expanded the duties of the Extension Service. County agents were authorized to broaden the 4–H club program, to render greater assistance to veterans, and to help farmers make use of new technology innovations. More than 40 million men and women are alumni of the 4–H club program today.

Research activities of the Department of Agriculture were also expanded. Extended activities of the State experiment stations and the land-grant colleges to include investigating scientific, technical, economic and other aspects of the laws and principles underlying the basic problems of agriculture. In some says, the Bankhead-Jones Act was an extension of the earlier Purnell Act of 1925 which had expanded the scope of agricultural research to include investigation of the social and economic problems associated with agriculture. The Purnell Act also expanded Federal funding to further the development of the agricultural extension system.

Two Acts signed into law on August 14, 1946, broadened the Department's authority in research and extension to include the marketing, transportation, and distribution of agricultural products. Also emphasized was research in human nutrition and the nutritive value of agricultural commodities. The Acts were the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 and the Research and Marketing Act of 1946.

The McIntire-Stennis Act of 1962 further expanded the research role of the Department. It authorized the Secretary of Agriculture "to cooperate with the several States for the purpose of encouraging and assisting them in carrying out programs of forestry research". This Act authorized appropriations to be distributed to States, on a matching fund basis, for forestry research at land-grant colleges or

other State supported institutions that maintain graduate level training in forestry related sciences and which have forestry schools.

More recently, the Rural Development Act of 1972 further broadened research and extension authorities to include work in rural development and small farm agriculture.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, several Government studies and congressional hearings were initiated in response to concerns about the adequacy and efficiency of the Federal-State agricultural research system. Specific criticisms pointed both to a lack of coordination, to duplication of research efforts, and to the lack of long-term planning. In response to these criticisms, Congress passed The National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act, as title XIV of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977.

This Act reiterated the historic role of the Department of Agriculture as the lead Federal agency for agricultural research. The Act also initiated several new programs of research including; a competitive research grant program oriented toward basic research and available to researchers outside the traditional land-grant institutions, a special nonformula grant program directed to selected high priority research topics such as energy or small farm operations, and the National Food and Human Nutrition Research and Extension Program which includes the employment of professoinal and paraprofessional aides to engage in direct nutrition education for low income families.

In addition, the Act set up two new advisory panels. The Joint Council on Food and Agricultural Sciences has the primary responsibility of fostering coordination of agricultural research, extension, and teaching activities of the Federal Government, the States, colleges and universities, and other public and private institutions and persons involved in the food and agricultural sciences. The National Agricultural Research and Extension Users Advisory Board is assigned responsibility to review and assess the policies, plans, and goals of research and extension programs.

The Congress continued the process of improving the coordination and providing a focus for agricultural research and education in the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 by authorizing an additional Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. This new Assistant Secretary is charged with the implementation and coordination of all research, extension, and teaching responsibilities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The 1981 Act also required the Joint Council to conduct a "needs assessment for the Food and Agricultural Sciences". This recently completed study is intended to serve as the first step in the process of long range planning and priority setting for the very complex, decentralized agricultural research and extension system.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT: LEGISLATION AND PROGRAMS

The Depression Era spawned a number of credit and grant programs designed to meet the basic needs of rural people and their communities. The impact of the Depression had revealed in stark terms the disparity in standards of living between city dwellers and rural residents. Congress responded to this problem, initially by providing funding for electrical service to rural areas and providing resources to make water available where droughts and water shortages had adversely effected rural residents. Congress created the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farmers Home Administration to provide these basic necessities.

The Rural Electrification Administration (REA) was established by Executive Order in 1935 as part of the New Deal emergency relief program. At that time, only 12 percent of all farms in the United States had electric service. The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 established REA as a lending agency with the statutory authority to make loans to improve electric service in rural areas. Loans could be made to construct and operate generating plants and transmission lines, and to develop distribution lines to bring power to rural residents without central station service.

Until 1944, REA made loans primarily to rural electric service cooperatives and public power districts at interest rates that fluctuated with the Government's cost of borrowing money. The Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 liberalized the terms of REA loans by establishing a fixed interest rate at the approximate cost of borrowing money, and extended the loan repayment period.

Congress expanded the purpose of REA in 1949 to authorize rural telephone loans in order to develop and improve telephone service in rural areas. At that time, only 36 percent of the farms had telephone service of some kind, much of which was of low quality.

Congress further expanded REA's assistance, in 1973, enacting major changes in the way REA finances its rural electric and telephone programs. One amendment to the Rural electrification Act established a revolving fund incorporating current assets and each year's loan repayments as a source of funds to make direct loans at subsidized interest rates. The amendment increased the interest rate on loans. Another 1973 amendment authorized REA to guarantee loans made to rural electric and telephone cooperatives by other Government and private lenders. These loan guarantees account for most of the financing obtained by these cooperatives today.

REA has largely achieved its objective of providing electric and telephone service to rural areas in the United States. Today, almost 99 percent of all the farms in America are electrified with REA-financed electric cooperatives serving almost 12 million consumers. In addition, 95 percent of all farms today have telephone service with REA-financed cooperatives serving over 5 million telephone subscribers.

The establishment and expansion of the Farmer's Home Administration's role to assist rural development activities had its genesis in congressional passage of the Water Facilities Act of 1937. This law authorized the Resettlement Administration to make loans for individual and association farm water systems in 17 western States. In 1954, Congress expanded this water supply program to apply nationwide and permitted nonfarm customers in rural towns to tie into farm area water systems.

The Agricultural Act of 1961 opened up participation in the water system program to the general rural population, including incorporated towns up to 2,500 in size. The loan limit on each project was raised for direct loans and insured loans. In 1965, Congress transformed the water facilities loan program into a loan and grant program for both water and waste disposal systems. Rural towns of up to 5,500 were made eligible to be included in FmHA-financed projects and the limit on FmHA financing was increased.

Congress has expanded the role of FmHA with additional programs to benefit families and communities in rural areas over the last decade. These programs make available loans and grants to provide modern sanitary water and sewer systems, other essential community facilities, safe and modest housing, and stimulate job growth through assistance to businesses and industries located in rural areas.

The Rural Development Act of 1972 recognized the growing diversity of needs in rural America by expanding existing programs and authorizing new programs designed to improve job opportunities, to increase incomes through investment resources, and to generally enhance the quality of rural life. Among its provisions, this Act authorized the FmHA to make loans to rural residents for small businesses, to guarantee loans made by commercial lenders for rural business and industry, to increase the authorization for water and waste disposal grants, to raise the population limit on towns included in FmHA-financed systems to 10,000 and to make loans for other essential community facilities. Subsequently, the Rural Development Policy Act of 1980 gave the Department of Agriculture the primary role in coordinating a national rural development program.

FmHA's rural development programs have contributed to an improvement in the quality of life in rural America and to providing additional job opportunities. Though farm population as a percentage of total rural residents has declined significantly since the 1930s, the influx of new residents into rural areas in search of new lifestyles highlights the interdependence that exists today between American farmers and their nonfarm rural neighbors. With more farm families

relying on off-farm income, Congress continues to be challenged by the need to encourage economic growth and new jobs though the development of farm-related and other rural enterprises, and improved coordination in Federal rural development efforts.

FOOD ASSISTANCE, CONSUMER, AND FOOD MARKET ACTIVITIES: LEGISLATION AND PROGRAMS

U.S. agricultural policymaking has long recognized the importance of what happens to food after it leaves the farm gate. Accordingly, the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry has devoted much of its energy to assuring that farm products reach consumers in a safe, high-quality, and affordable form.

The Committee has authority over a long list of laws that embody these concerns. They include the domestic food assistance programs, the Federal meat and poultry inspection statutes, and legislation affecting the marketing of agricultural products.

The domestic food programs administered by the Department of Agriculture are intended to make constructive use of our Nation's agricultural abundance and strengthen demand for farm products by helping to feed hungry persons. The programs can be traced to enactment of section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935. Aimed at coping with large crop surpluses and depressed farm prices, this authority permanently earmarked an amount equal to 30 percent of the "gross receipts from duties collected under the customs laws" to encourage domestic consumption and export of agricultural commodities. One specified use was donations to low-income persons. By 1939 the Federal Government was distributing foods to 12.7 million unemployed and poor persons suffering under the weight of the Great Depression. The early Federal commodity donations also helped to spur expansion of locally-operated school lunch programs, as schools became the first regular institutional recipients of section 32 foods.

The National School Lunch Act of 1946 permanently authorized Federal cash assistance for school meals. Under the law, the Secretary of Agriculture was to assist States, primarily through grants-in-aid, to set up and operate lunch programs in schools "to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food . . .". States were required to match the Federal funds, to assure that meals met certain nutritional standards, and to assure that participating local authorities offered meals free or at discounted prices to children unable to pay the full cost.

Congress modified Federal commodity donations with the enactment of section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949. This authority authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide schools and other institutions with basic commodities acquired under farm

price support activities. Section 32 was subsequently limited to the purchase and distribution of so-called perishable items, such as livestock products and produce.

The first significant changes in the 1946 school lunch law were adopted in 1962, under a climate of rising concern about poverty in the Unites States and a desire to help schools lacking the resources to provide low-cost meals to poor pupils. The legislation permanently authorized, under section 11 of the 1946 Act, additional funding to States to support free and reduced-price lunches in economically depressed areas.

After national interest in hunger and poverty problems intensified during the 1960s, there was an explosion of new laws expanding Federal support for child nutrition. The first major child feeding law during this period was the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 which among other things created a school breakfast program, offered schools support for food service equipment, specifically authorized a special milk program (first initiated in 1954) and provided States with administrative funding. In 1968, special meal programs for children in day care centers and summer camps were authorized. A succession of laws in 1970, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1977, and 1978 were intended to stengthen and expand school lunch, school breakfast, and the non-school food programs.

Separate programs aimed at supporting low-income pregnant and lactating mothers and their young children also were evolving during this period. The first effort, launched administratively by the Agriculture Department in 1969, distributed certain types of commodities to pregnant women and infants. This new effort was eventually written into the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 as the commodity supplemental food program (CSFP).

A similar program for the same clientele known as the special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children (WIC) would soon overtake CSFP in both caseload and funding. Since its creation, WIC has grown into a $1.5 billion yearly effort providing special food packages, health screening, and nutritional counseling.

Between 1970 and 1980, total spending for all child nutrition grew from about $2.4 billion to more than $8 billion; the Federal contribution alone had climbed during the period from $750 million to over $4.7 billion. The largest federally-supported child nutrition program by far was school lunch, which by the 1979–80 school year was serving an average of nearly 27 million students daily in more than 94,000 schools.

Meanwhile, separate programs were underway aimed at improving the nutritional status of needy families in general. These programs would not be targeted to special groups like children but rather be made available mainly on the basis of low income. During the late 1930s, more than 60 different types of section 32 acquired commodities were being distributed. In 1949, needy families also became eligible for CCC items acquired under section 416 of the Agriculture Act of 1949.

The commodity program would eventually be eclipsed by the food stamp program, which had operated on a pilot basis from 1939 to 1943 and again beginning in fiscal 1961. The program received ongoing authority under the Food Stamp Act of 1964. The new food stamp law enabled low-income families to use coupons in retail stores to purchase a more varied and nutritionally adequate diet than available through the receipt of donated commodities.

In 1965, food stamps were a $60 million program serving fewer than half a million clients. During the late 1960s and 1970s, however, hunger lobby groups and their allies in the Congress made expanded food assistance a top priority. During this time, food stamps and other food programs grew rapidly.

For example, the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 expanded food stamp eligibility and provided for nationwide implementation of the program, requiring all counties that were still offering commodities to convert to food stamps.

The Food Stamp Act of 1977 revamped the program, eliminating the purchase requirement for all households and simplifying qualifying standards. Although the new law also capped annual spending and reduced the universe of potentially eligible households, elimination of the buy-in requirement caused a net expansion of participation to those who had always qualified but had simply not signed up before. By 1980, the program had grown to about 21 million participants and a cost of over $9 billion.

Nutrition program expansion reached a high water mark by 1980, when the Congress, led at times by the Committee, began to take a series of steps to limit costs. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Acts of 1980 and 1981 achieved cutbacks in the child nutrition programs. Still, school lunches in fiscal 1982 served an average of more than 23 million children daily, at a Federal cost of roughly $2.3 billion.

The Food Stamp Act Amendments of 1980, the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981, and the 1981 and 1982 budget reconciliation laws all contained provisions to tighten food stamp benefits, restrict eligibility, and improve program operation. Nevertheless the program expended about $12 billion, and served about 22 million recipients, in fiscal 1983.

The food stamp law formerly prohibited dual operation of the food stamp and commodity distribution programs. The prohibition was eased in the early 1980s as the Federal Government sought to dispose of its growing agricultural surpluses, acquired under price support programs, by providing dairy and other commodities to needy families and institutions. In fiscal year 1985 alone, almost $1 billion worth of surplus Department of Agriculture foods were distributed by State and local agencies, whose operations were funded in part by $50 million in annual Federal support.

Attention to consumer food protection, another issue of longstanding interest to the Committee, can be traced to publication of Upton Sinclair's *The Jungle*, which described the unsanitary conditions

in some meat packing plants near the turn of the century. Congress responded by passing an amendment to the 1906 Agricultural Appropriations Act that for the first time mandated the inspection of meat for human consumption. The Meat Inspection Act of 1907 made this authority permanent. Today, meat packers must submit to mandatory postmortem and antemortem inspection of all meat products transported in interstate commerce. Since its passage, the 1907 law has helped to assure that all meat crossing State lines is wholesome, safe and properly labeled.

Congress in 1957 adopted the Poultry Products Inspection Act which brought all interstate sales of poultry products under mandatory Federal inspection. And, in 1970, mandatory inspection of certain egg products was required.

The Talmadge-Aiken Act, adopted in 1962, authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into cooperative agreements with States to foster uniform administration of agricultural laws in general. The 1962 law was applied to meat in 1967 with passage of the Wholesome Meat Act, and to poultry the following year with passage of the Wholesome Poultry Products Act. These Acts greatly strengthened and updated the 1907 and 1957 laws, improved intrastate inspection, and tightened controls over imported meat products.

During the past decade, diet and nutrition also have been on the Committee's agenda. For example, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 contained a major subtitle, the National Food and Human Nutrition Research and Extension Program, which encouraged the Department of Agriculture to conduct more human nutrition research, establish a national nutrition education program and, with Federal health officials, develop a system to monitor America's nutritional status.

Marketing of farm products is extremely important; in 1985, for example, only $85 billion of the $346 billion that consumers spent for U.S. farm-produced food was returned to the farmer. The balance went to food handlers, processors and retailers, according to the Department of Agriculture. Congress has enacted a number of measures to help ensure that the market functions fairly for agricultural producers, middlemen and consumers alike.

For example, the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act was established in 1930 to encourage fair trading between sellers and buyers of perishable commodities, or fruits and vegetables. In 1921, the Packers and Stockyards Act was enacted to protect farmers and ranchers from unscrupulous practices by meatpacking companies, to provide them with a fair price for their livestock and poultry, and to safeguard consumers.

From their modest start in the 1930s as an outlet for farm surpluses, the Federal food programs have evolved into a complex array of nutrition and income support activities for millions of Americans. In fiscal 1983, Federal domestic food assistance cost $19 billion, partially or wholly subsidizing an estimated 95 million meals each day. In recent years, one of the Committee's chief tasks has been to ascertain

the extent to which these programs are—or are not—reaching those persons who need them. Implicit in this task is the necessity to curtail waste and to improve administration. Moreover, any proposals for more generous support must be weighed alongside the need to reduce the persistent Federal deficit.

The Committee also will be asked in coming years to make difficult choices affecting the processing, movement, and distribution of food to all citizens. Meat and poultry inspection, for example, has been caught in a continuing tug-of-war between those who believe the statutes should be more exacting and those who call for a more flexible attitude toward the industry to reflect advances in food technology over the past decade. Such choices—in these and other consumer and marketing programs—must be made with care, for the Nation's food processing and delivery system has become more sophisticated with each passing year.

THE FUTURE

Throughout this very brief presentation of legislative history, one can readily see that the desire and effort to provide farmers and rural residents with education, services, and economic opportunity comparable to that of other areas has been constant and real. Some success has been achieved. Some early legislation, notably establishment of land-grant colleges, has demonstrated great foresight and enlightenment. The social and economic impact of this and other forward looking legislation has contributed materially to our progress.

There is still more to accomplish. Great changes are taking place in agriculture and in rural America. Our cities are becoming less of a magnet for the Nation's population, and migration to rural areas exceeded migration to urban areas between 1970 and 1980 for the first time in more than 100 years. Policies in agriculture and related fields have great impact on the rest of our country, yet less than 10 percent of the people in rural America are members of farm families. We must preserve our heritage—our cultural productive/capacity unequalled in the world today—while we provide for the future. Therefore, it is incumbent upon all of us to leave to those who follow a better and more productive farm sector and rural environment in which to work and live.

Above all, our agricultural production plant must be maintained so that it can continue to provide us with the necessary food and fiber. Assuring the American farmer an adequate farm income, providing food at reasonable prices to the Nation's consumers, and building markets for our agricultural products abroad are three interlocking goals. The complexity of the agriculture sector increases the challenge to Congress to develop policies and programs that will add stability to the agriculture sector while attempting to attain these goals. But somehow the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, the Congress, and the Nation as a whole must work to make it possible to achieve these objectives.

○